

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, does the Senator from Pennsylvania wish to dispose of that motion now?

Mr. DAVIS. No, Mr. President, I will take the matter up at the usual time. I simply give notice that I have entered the motion to reconsider the vote, and I will discuss the matter at a later date.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 26 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, February 15, 1940, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate February 13 (legislative day of February 7), 1940

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Philip B. Fleming, of Iowa, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, Department of Labor.

PROMOTION IN THE REGULAR ARMY

Capt. Charles Carlton, Infantry, to be major from December 16, 1939.

NOTE.—Captain Carlton was nominated January 4, 1940, and confirmed January 16, 1940, with rank from December 17, 1939. This message is submitted for the purpose of correcting an error in his date of rank, as a supplementary report of death of Maj. Francis G. Bonham, Infantry, gives date of death as December 15, 1939, instead of December 16, 1939, as previously reported.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 13, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon, and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore, Mr. RAYBURN.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our most merciful Father, out of the depths from which spring humility, reverence, and faith do we appeal unto Thee for guidance and help. We pray that we shall receive such a portion of Thy spirit that we may be faithful and just in the daily duties of life; we rejoice that the Almighty One is a sun that shines on cabin and palace. Oh, give us the power of that faith to declare that the time will come when the nation that breaks its promises and sows to the wind shall of that wind reap the whirlwind; the blessed Lord help us to take no counsel of crouching fear, for with Thee a thousand years are as a day. O my soul, let us believe that self-discipline is the most stable form of character building and that the golden words of liberty, opportunity, and integrity will be the watchwords not only for our Republic but for the nations of earth. In the name of our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that on the following dates the President approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On February 9, 1940:

H. R. 5634. An act granting 6 months' pay to Sidney M. Bowen;

H. R. 5734. An act for the relief of World War sailors and marines who were discharged from the United States Navy or United States Marine Corps because of minority or misrepresentation of age; and

H. R. 6124. An act giving the consent of Congress to the addition of lands to the State of Texas and ceding jurisdiction to the State of Texas over certain parcels or tracts of land heretofore acquired by the United States of America from the United Mexican States.

On February 12, 1940:

H. R. 4532. An act to make effective in the District Court of the United States for Puerto Rico rules promulgated by the Supreme Court of the United States governing pleading, practice, and procedure in the district courts of the United States;

H. R. 7805. An act making supplemental appropriations for the Military and Naval Establishments, Coast Guard, and Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 8067. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1940, and for other purposes.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent Mr. BOLAND and Mr. LUDLOW were granted permission to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after disposition of business on the Speaker's table and the business of the day, I may address the House for 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks by inserting in the RECORD a letter I have received from Acting Secretary of the Treasury Bell, in answer to a speech made on the floor of the House by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] on February 6.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

MERIT SYSTEM FOR GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?
There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, last week this body considered and passed the so-called civil-service bill.

During debate while that bill was being considered we heard much about the merit system, much about the obligation of the Government to its employees, much about the humanitarianism of government.

Soon the United States Government is to start taking the decennial census. Applications are already being taken for some 250,000 to 275,000 temporary employees to take this census. Already these jobs are being promised to party workers and local politicians. Many of these political appointments have already been made.

In contrast to this, some 10,000,000 Americans are still out of employment. Made-work registers are still filled with names of needy persons awaiting their turn to work for the Government. Relief lists are still filled with the names of those who would do an honest day's work but cannot, so they must depend upon public assistance.

At the last session of this Congress I introduced a bill—H. R. 7148—providing that all temporary employees hired to take the 1940 census, excepting those under civil service and veterans' preference, be taken from the rolls of those certified as being in need of public assistance or made work. Today that bill remains pigeonholed in the rooms of the Committee on the Census.

Along with the hopes and ambitions and desires for work of millions of Americans it lies buried, while 250,000 jobs are being handed out to political satellites in preparation for the elections this fall.

Certainly there are people on the public-relief rolls today who are qualified to take this census. It does not require any great ability or special training to ask the housewife whether she shares her bathroom with others or uses it alone. Certainly it does not require any political training to qualify for asking the questions required by the Bureau of the Census.

It may take some expert talking to persuade Americans that they must divulge to some local politicians the amount of salary or wages they made last year or the number of weeks worked in 1939. It may require considerable argument to persuade Americans that such questions are not an invasion of their rights, but it should not require any special ability or training to write down the answers if the answer is given.

I know there are thousands of persons on the relief rolls who are just as well qualified to ask those questions as are the political appointees who are being promised those jobs.

For this Congress to sit here and calmly give its consent to keeping nine or ten million American citizens on the relief rolls and then passing out some 250,000 jobs to political friends for political purposes is not justice. It is not humanitarian. It is not the American way of doing things. And neither is it good business nor economical government.

Hundreds of other cities and villages are in the same position as my district. Relief loads have grown so heavy that local government is facing bankruptcy. Bond limits have been reached. Taxpayers are unable to pay their taxes.

Yet here we have the spectacle of the American Government handing out a quarter of a million jobs on a basis of political reward while 10,000,000 needy Americans still hunt for work.

Last week we voted to extend civil service to between 250,000 and 300,000 employees of the Government. I voted for that bill because I believe in merit and justice.

For the same reason, I ask the Members of this House to demand consideration of this bill, which would offer 250,000 jobs in the 1940 census to those Americans who need them. Let us not be just and humanitarian only where it will help politically; let us be just and humanitarian where it will help restore the self-respect of Americans who are anxious to work. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McDOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include an address I delivered last night at Parkersburg, W. Va.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LELAND M. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a short editorial from the Palasadian.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL YOUTH CONGRESS

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I believe that Members of Congress should be deeply concerned over the events that have transpired as the result of a recent convention of the National Youth Congress in the Nation's Capital.

We read with mixed emotions that the President of the United States and the First Lady were both hissed and booed when they addressed the convention and asked the assembled young people to think twice before committing themselves on problems of national and international importance. Yesterday we witnessed Members of the House of Representatives being derided here on the floor by young men and women of the youth organization who were assembled in the galleries. These manifestations that were in such poor taste can be

ignored as bad manners, but there is an underlying factor involved which cannot be so easily disregarded.

A great many of the young persons who attended the convention are not yet mature enough to think things through for themselves. Where, then, are they having instilled in their minds such ideas of disrespect for the duly elected representatives of the United States? Where are they absorbing the philosophy that their only hope for the future lies in coming to Washington and lobbying for a hand-out of half a billion dollars? We Members of Congress should concern ourselves with this problem, which is immediate and pressing, and try to find the solution.

I do not believe that any of us can be justly accused of not having the future welfare of American youth at heart. Most of us are raising children of our own and I am sure that most of us are doing our best to train them in the true traditions of real Americanism. We hope that our children will learn to follow the principles of constitutional government as laid down by Washington and preserved by Lincoln. We hope that they will learn the proper respect for the constituted authorities and representatives of our democracy.

Jobs for young Americans are perhaps our primary consideration, if we do not want our youth to grow into manhood and womanhood expecting the Government to meet their every demand for assistance. Self-reliance and the ability to create and seize upon opportunity have made this Nation great, and these fundamental principles must be continued.

Let us concern ourselves with those individuals and organizations who are preaching un-American doctrines. We should resolve here and now that we will seek out and destroy the underlying causes for the undemocratic tendencies that are being drilled into some of the youth movements throughout the country. After all, the young people of today are the citizens of tomorrow, and they must be prepared to take over the reins of government when we relinquish our duties. I fervently hope that they will be prepared to meet their responsibility in traditional American style. [Applause.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from today's Washington Post.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SECREST. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by Senator GUY M. GILLETTE at the annual banquet of the Washington College of Law on February 10, 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by a fellow-townsmen.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. KEEFE asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.

THE 1940 CENSUS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, in answer to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. YOUNGDAHL], on his suggestion to change the method of appointing census enumerators, and have the enumerators selected from the relief rolls, I want to say that

such a proposition is out of the question. It never has been done and it will not be done this time.

What the Bureau of the Census is trying to do is to select men and women in the various communities through a special test and get enumerators who are qualified to take the census, as the regulations provide.

Taking the census is not a guessing contest. The reports of the Census Bureau are supposed to be accurate, and what we are trying to do is to get a correct census of all the people of the United States. The machinery has already been set up and arrangements have been made for special examinations for these enumerators. They are to be selected in this way in every congressional district in the United States.

If the gentleman wants to come before the Census Committee, of which I am a member, I assure him we shall be glad to hear him; but the idea of coming before the House and demanding that we select all these enumerators from relief rolls to me is ridiculous.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. If I have time, I yield for a brief question.

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Does the gentleman recall that an appearance was made before the Committee of the Census last spring in which some of us asked that there be a hearing on this matter, that the Director of the Census be called and also the Director of the W. P. A. to discuss this matter?

Mr. RANKIN. Was not that the time the gentleman from Minnesota appeared?

Mr. YOUNGDAHL. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. The members of the committee did not take it seriously enough to comply with that request, because they thought it was unreasonable.

These criticisms of the Bureau of the Census are unjust. I note, for instance, that objections have been raised to the inclusion of a question in this year's census of population concerning how much wages or salary each person made last year. This has been called an invasion of people's privacy and a violation of individual rights.

Many times, during the 150 years that the census has been the fact-finder of the Nation, much more searchingly personal questions have been asked by its enumerators. And the American people have answered these questions, not because it is a misdemeanor to refuse but because they have confidence in the census, what it stands for, and its long, fine record of keeping the answers confidential.

FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS IS THE TOP

Most of the complaints about this question of earnings—and they have been few—seem to be based upon a complete misconception, because most of them come from people who make very substantial salaries and who do not wish to report these salaries to the local census enumerators.

Therefore, most of the complaints are withdrawn when the ones who made them are informed that the ceiling on this question is \$5,000, and that any person making more than that simply states, "over \$5,000."

This is because the purpose of the question is to determine mass buying power for the purchase of consumption of goods, and incomes above \$5,000 seldom are so expended. This purpose is the basis for the popular support of this question: To determine the extent of mass buying power in the field of consumption goods. That is an aim understood by every businessman in the country, every manufacturer, wholesaler, and retailer.

The question on earnings is said to be "personal," even though every census worker is sworn to secrecy under penalty of \$1,000 fine and 2 years' imprisonment if he reveals a single fact he learns in line of duty, and even though a century and a half of census experience proves that census confidences are preserved.

HOW QUESTIONS ARE CHOSEN

Far more revealing questions have been asked, successfully, by the census in the past. Would it be too personal to require every adult to tell the census taker the value of all the real

estate he owns, and the value of all the other property in his estate? Half of that was required 90 years ago, in 1850, under President Zachary Taylor; and all of it was required in 1860 and 1870, under President Buchanan and President Grant.

Who wants these statistical averages of the wages and salary of the American people? That is the crux of the whole question. A sample cross-section of the public demand for this question is easily obtainable from the Census Bureau and might surprise many people.

To begin with, the Census Bureau does not think up questions with which to annoy people. It is deluged before every census with thousands of questions which all sorts of responsible groups want it to ask. And it calls together, in a truly democratic way the leaders of the most important interested groups to help it sift these questions down to the minimum number of basically important questions.

WHO WANTS TO KNOW?

For 2 days, almost a year ago, it had in conference here in Washington more than 50 leaders in business, manufacturing, labor, government, together with statistical experts. That was on March 3 and 4, 1939. They were called here by Secretary Hopkins to discuss this very question of salary, and others like it, for the 1940 census.

Here is what the proceedings of that conference say:

Satisfaction was expressed particularly with the inquiries relating to migration, employment, unemployment, and economic status.

It should be borne in mind that this refers to the very material on wages and salaries, as well as other incomes, which is still on the question list for the 1940 census.

Now, who attended that conference? Here are only a few: Dr. Louis Dublin, of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co.; Dr. David R. Craig, president of the American Retail Federation; Mr. Noel Sargent, secretary of the National Association of Manufacturers; Gen. Robert E. Wood, chairman of Sears, Roebuck; Sidney R. Katz, of the C. I. O.; and Miss Margaret Scattergood, of the A. F. of L.; and Dr. Stacy May, of the Rockefeller Foundation. This is just a few of the people in this conference who saw nothing wrong with this question. They largely represent the very ones who will have to answer these questions—both labor and capital.

WIDE RANGE OF REQUESTS

Who else believes that this question is in the public interest?

In the cross-section of requests for statistics on earnings of the American people are letters and resolutions from the American Home Economics Association, the National Industrial Conference Board, the Actuarial Society of America, the Population Association of America, from ministers and church councils, Y. M. C. A.'s, insurance companies, automobile manufacturers, public utilities, labor unions, advertising agencies and market analysts, publishers such as Senator CAPPER and Meredith and McFadden and the Associated Farm Papers. There are even requests from two Representatives and one Senator.

"STRONGLY RECOMMENDED"

One of these requests came from a conference sponsored by the National Bureau of Economic Research, which includes directors from such groups as the American Engineering Council, the American Management Association, the National Publishers Association, and the American Federation of Labor. I want to quote you what this conference reported to the Secretary of Commerce:

The conference went on record as strongly recommending the inclusion of such questions (questions on income) in the (1940) census.

It also should be remembered that this income question was approved unanimously by the advisory committee to the Census Bureau, composed of Dr. Robert E. Chaddock, of Columbia University; Dr. J. Frederick Dewhurst, of the Twentieth Century Fund; Mr. Paul T. Cherington, market analyst; Dr. William F. Ogburn, of the University of Chicago; Dr. Murray R. Benedict, of the University of California; and Dr. Willard R. Thorp, of Dun & Bradstreet.

This information is not to be used to air the private affairs of the individual, any more than in his income-tax returns. But it is for the purpose of compiling statistics that will be of value to all the American people.

I trust members will desist from unnecessary criticisms of the Bureau of the Census, and join us in helping to make the 1940 census a success.

It is a matter in which all our people are interested, and the Bureau is entitled to the moral as well as the official support of every Member of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Minnesota is absolutely right in his attempt to call to the attention of the House the fact that Minnesota is being discriminated against in connection with its unemployment relief problem as far as the Federal Government is concerned. Thousands of people in our State have been certified for W. P. A., yet they are lying around starving to death trying to get work, but denied work by the Administrator of the W. P. A. I call the attention of the House to the following news item taken from the Minneapolis Star-Journal of January 29:

CITY READIES PLEA FOR MORE JOBS ON W. P. A.—STOLTE TO RECEIVE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE WEDNESDAY

Definite effort to obtain 1,000 to 2,500 more W. P. A. jobs for Minneapolis relief clients will be made by the city council ways and means committee Wednesday at a meeting with S. L. Stolte, State W. P. A. administrator.

The meeting was arranged today after Nathan Harris, city utilities engineer, told a joint session of the committee and the welfare board 2,712 relief clients are now awaiting W. P. A. assignment here, out of a total of 9,690 in the entire State.

Stolte had written the committee complaining the city is operating too many "white collar" W. P. A. projects, and that it should have more strictly labor projects.

Harris showed that Hennepin County now has 8,726 on W. P. A. jobs, or 18.8 percent of the State total of 46,528. Minneapolis' relief load now is 33.2 percent of the State's total load, Harris said, indicating the city is entitled to many more W. P. A. jobs than have been assigned here.

Reports showed the three largest W. P. A. projects now in operation here, including one of the city engineer, one of the park board, and the relief department's sewing project, were intended to employ 7,386 relief clients but total employed on these now is only 3,711.

Heads of the departments said they could give work to 2,000 or more relief clients on these projects if the workers were certified by W. P. A.

As you see, we have gone into this matter with the administrators, both Federal and State, but we seem to get nowhere. My colleague's contention that we have many people out there qualified to serve as census enumerators is correct. In Minneapolis alone there are 62,500 people on relief. If we cannot find someone out of that group of 62,500 qualified to serve as census enumerators then I miss my guess.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ALEXANDER. I yield.

Mr. RANKIN. Even if we did take the enumerators from the relief rolls, it would simply cut down the number of people employed by the Government instead of increasing it.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Oh, no.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; it would.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Not at all because we have many more people out there eligible to be placed on the W. P. A. rolls. What I understand the gentleman wants to suggest was to take those qualified relief people and appoint them as census enumerators instead of political appointments, such as the wife of a man already working, or the reverse.

Mr. RANKIN. No; he suggested that they be taken from the relief rolls.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to insert herewith a statistical report on the Minnesota W. P. A. situation as compared with the other States. You will note that Minneapolis and St. Paul rank 32 and 28, respectively, in the list of 41 largest cities:

UTILITIES ENGINEER.

Minneapolis, Minn., December 28, 1939.

Subject: Federal Aid to Cities Through W. P. A. Expenditures.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE,

Minneapolis, Minn.

GENTLEMEN: Attached hereto are two tables developed from a bulletin recently received in this office from the Social Security Board, Washington, D. C.

Table I discloses the total expenditure from public funds during the month of August 1939 for public relief in each of the 41 cities of the United States having a population of more than 200,000. For your further information the data for Duluth and Des Moines, each having a population of under 200,000, are also shown, inasmuch as these are the nearest larger urban centers not included in the regular list. Table I shows for each of these cities the population, total relief outlay, total W. P. A. earnings, and the percentage of total relief outlay in the form of W. P. A. earnings.

Table II rearranges the list of cities so as to show their rank order from a standpoint of the percentage of W. P. A. earnings in relation to total public-relief expense.

The figures for 1 month only may, of course, not be an adequate index of relative aid furnished by W. P. A. in the various urban centers, but it is significant, nevertheless, to note that for the month referred to 31 out of these 41 cities had a higher percentage of relief burden carried through W. P. A. expenditures than was the case in Minneapolis. Furthermore, the cities of Duluth and Des Moines likewise benefited by a higher percentage of their public-relief expense being carried through W. P. A. outlay than is the case in Minneapolis. You will further observe that the 3 cities having the highest percentage of Federal aid in this form were the southern cities of Atlanta, Birmingham, and New Orleans, each reporting more than 80 percent of their public-relief expense in the form of earnings of W. P. A. workers.

Minneapolis, with a 47.6 percent of public-relief expense in the form of W. P. A. earnings, ranks 32d in the list of 41 cities.

To what extent this disparity between the proportion of local relief expense borne by W. P. A. in the city of Minneapolis and the corresponding proportion in most of the other large cities of the United States is due to local policy on W. P. A. projects requiring skilled labor, or is due to Federal policy in allocating W. P. A. quotas, is not determined.

This data is being submitted merely for the purpose of giving your committee the benefit of the latest information we have on the subject.

Respectfully submitted.

NATHAN HARRIS, Utilities Engineer.

TABLE I.—Public-relief expense in cities of over 200,000 population

Pop- ulation rank	City	Popula- tion 1933, census es- timate	Public-relief expenditures		
			Total	Work Projects Ad- ministration	
				Earnings	Percent of total
1	New York City	7,154,300	\$18,295,000	\$9,480,000	51.9
2	Chicago	3,490,700	8,317,000	4,586,000	55.1
3	Philadelphia	1,972,700	4,841,000	1,590,000	32.9
4	Detroit	1,666,100	4,160,000	2,797,000	67.3
5	Los Angeles	1,354,100	5,493,000	1,706,000	31.1
6	Cleveland	918,400	3,276,000	2,221,000	67.9
7	St. Louis	830,300	1,560,000	1,167,000	74.8
8	Baltimore	817,100	699,000	221,000	31.6
9	Boston	786,900	2,452,000	1,329,000	54.2
10	Pittsburgh	678,500	3,136,000	949,000	30.2
11	San Francisco	656,200	1,640,000	826,000	50.4
12	Washington, D. C.	608,000	662,000	500,970	75.7
13	Milwaukee	599,100	2,004,000	1,225,000	61.2
14	Buffalo	584,400	1,286,000	430,000	33.5
15	Minneapolis	477,700	1,467,000	698,000	47.6
16	New Orleans	471,000	983,000	800,000	81.4
17	Cincinnati	460,100	1,048,000	603,000	57.5
18	Newark	447,000	1,312,000	715,000	54.5
19	Kansas City	412,600	776,000	533,000	68.6
20	Seattle	374,100	817,000	413,000	50.6
21	Indianapolis	372,100	908,000	579,000	63.8
22	Rochester, N. Y.	333,500	616,000	93,000	15.1
23	Jersey City	319,900	515,000	304,000	59.0
24	Houston	317,900	333,000	228,000	68.5
25	Louisville	317,500	281,000	223,000	79.3
26	Portland, Ore.	309,100	595,000	331,000	55.6
27	Columbus, Ohio	299,700	739,000	444,000	60.0
28	Toledo	298,900	970,000	628,000	64.8
29	Oakland	295,600	1,292,000	688,000	53.2
30	Denver	293,200	674,000	227,000	33.8
31	Atlanta	280,400	507,000	463,000	91.5
32	Dallas	278,000	306,000	202,000	66.0
33	St. Paul	277,900	721,000	384,000	53.2
34	Birmingham	273,300	321,000	273,000	85.0
35	Akron	265,100	801,000	578,000	72.1
36	Memphis	261,500	317,000	229,000	72.3
37	Providence	255,600	437,000	200,000	45.7
38	San Antonio	243,500	296,000	225,000	76.0
39	Omaha	217,800	502,000	383,000	76.3
40	Syracuse, N. Y.	214,500	439,000	107,000	24.4
41	Dayton	206,600	529,000	299,000	56.5
42	Des Moines	145,300	448,000	282,000	63.0
43	Duluth	101,900	707,000	402,000	56.8

NOTE.—Population from U. S. Bureau of Census; expenditures from Social Security Board; Dec. 28, 1939.

TABLE II.—Ranking of cities according to percentage of relief expense under Work Projects Administration

City	Percent of relief expense under Work Projects Administration	Rank, order of Work Projects Administration percent	Rank, order of population
Atlanta	91.5	1	31
Birmingham	85	2	34
New Orleans	81.4	3	16
Louisville	79.3	4	25
Omaha	76.3	5	39
San Antonio	76.0	6	38
Washington, D. C.	75.7	7	12
St. Louis	74.8	8	7
Memphis	72.3	9	35
Akron	72.1	10	35
Kansas City	68.6	11	19
Houston	68.5	12	24
Cleveland	67.9	13	6
Detroit	67.3	14	4
Dallas	66.0	15	32
Toledo	64.8	16	28
Indianapolis	63.8	17	21
Milwaukee	61.2	18	13
Columbus	60.0	19	27
Jersey City	59.0	20	23
Cincinnati	57.5	21	17
Dayton, Ohio	56.5	22	41
Portland, Ore.	55.6	23	26
Chicago	55.1	24	2
Newark	54.5	25	18
Boston	54.2	26	9
Oakland	53.2	27	29
St. Paul	53.2	28	33
New York City	51.9	29	1
Seattle	50.6	30	20
San Francisco	50.4	31	11
Minneapolis	47.6	32	15
Providence	45.7	33	37
Denver	33.8	34	30
Buffalo	33.5	35	14
Philadelphia	32.9	36	3
Baltimore	31.6	37	8
Los Angeles	31.1	38	5
Pittsburgh	30.2	39	10
Syracuse	24.4	40	40
Rochester	15.1	41	22

NEARBY CITIES UNDER 200,000 POPULATION

Duluth	56.8		
Des Moines	63.0		

The following report serves to show the rankest sort of discrimination as to W. P. A. apportionment in the State itself as far as St. Paul and Minneapolis are concerned, giving rise to the argument by my colleague that census jobs should be filled from relief rolls if the W. P. A. cannot find other work:

Table of W. P. A. and direct-relief case loads

(W. P. A. data from Federal authorities. Direct relief data from State authorities)
[Counties arranged in rank order of ratio of W. P. A. to direct-relief load]

County	At work, Dec. 27, 1939	Total case load December 1939	Persons at work in percent of case load
1. Winona	671		
2. Swift	330		
3. Fillmore	244		
4. Le Sueur	138		
5. Carver	122		
6. Roseau	151	12	1,258.3
7. Sibley	123	10	1,230.0
8. Becker	711	86	825.7
9. Red Lake	77	10	770.0
10. McLeod	165	24	687.5
11. Morrison	729	108	675.0
12. Kittson	282	44	640.9
13. Clearwater	269	44	611.4
14. Clay	297	53	560.4
15. Cook	231	42	550.0
16. Murray	300	60	500.0
17. Pennington	157	34	461.8
18. Traverse	118	27	437.0
19. Wadena	166	42	395.2
20. Brown	300	80	375.0
21. Otter Tail	684	187	365.8
22. Wabasha	283	86	329.1
23. Todd	436	137	318.2
24. Kandiyohi	343	110	311.8
25. Stearns	1,199	393	305.1
26. Big Stone	303	100	303.0
27. Sherburne	197	67	294.0
28. Mahanomen	345	121	285.1
29. Blue Earth	358	132	271.2
30. Lake of the Woods	137	53	258.5

Table of W. P. A. and direct-relief case loads—Continued

County	At work Dec. 27, 1939	Total case load December 1939	Persons at work in percent of case load
31. Pipestone	164	69	237.7
32. Carlton	387	167	231.7
33. Houston	187	86	217.4
34. Watonwan	87	41	212.2
35. Dodge	130	62	209.7
36. Rock	71	35	202.9
37. Jackson	76	38	200.0
38. Stevens	157	80	196.3
39. Meeker	210	108	194.4
40. Hubbard	343	178	192.7
41. Chippewa	438	230	190.4
42. Norman	208	110	189.1
43. Redwood	193	104	185.6
44. Cass	587	333	176.3
45. Douglas	316	180	175.6
46. Crow Wing	486	288	173.4
47. Lac Qui Parle	332	192	172.9
48. Mower	245	146	167.8
49. Lincoln	145	88	164.8
50. Yellow Medicine	231	147	157.1
51. Nicollet	109	70	155.7
52. Grant	125	85	147.1
53. Martin	139	96	144.8
54. Benton	183	128	143.0
55. Itasca	693	485	142.9
56. Atkin	450	325	138.5
57. Anoka	401	292	137.3
58. Cottonwood	120	89	134.8
59. Lyon	206	155	132.9
60. Mille Lacs	295	229	128.8
61. Nobles	112	87	128.7
62. Steele	113	88	128.4
63. Kanabec	128	101	126.7
64. Marshall	124	99	125.3
65. Goodhue	167	134	124.6
66. Rice	339	282	120.2
67. Beltrami	957	811	118.0
68. Washington	351	301	116.6
69. Pine	317	274	115.7
70. Isanti	184	161	114.3
71. Freeborn	267	245	109.0
72. Polk	374	363	103.0
73. Olmsted	373	374	99.7
74. Dakota	344	346	99.4
75. Waseca	139	145	95.9
76. Wright	258	273	94.5
77. Pope	185	211	87.7
78. Faribault	205	239	85.8
79. Lake	98	117	83.8
80. St. Louis	5,874	7,033	83.5
81. Wilkin	97	119	81.5
82. Renville	194	241	80.5
83. Koochiching	275	394	69.8
84. Scott	69	101	68.3
85. Ramsey	4,967	8,035	61.8
86. Hennepin	8,726	14,171	61.6
87. Chisago	63	116	54.3
Total	43,240	41,759	103.5
Total without Hennepin County	34,514	27,588	125.1
Median			176.3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a radio address by the minority leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], which he delivered last night in connection with the Lincoln Day celebrations.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by placing in the Appendix of the Record the testimony given by Mr. Coulter before the Ways and Means Committee.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE]?

There was no objection.

NAVY DEPARTMENT AND NAVAL SERVICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1941

Mr. SCRUGHAM, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 8438) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 1587), which was read a first and second time and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DITTER reserved all points of order on the bill.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the

state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8438) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; and pending that motion I ask unanimous consent that general debate may continue throughout the day, and that the time be equally divided between myself and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM]?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask if it is the intention to have Calendar Wednesday business on tomorrow?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair may say for the information of the gentleman that that is the intention. The Chair may say further, in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], which is a proper one, that previously we have been calling one committee on the calendar each Wednesday. The Committee on Indian Affairs may have several bills for consideration tomorrow. It may be that this will require until 2 or 3 o'clock. The Chair feels that it would not be quite fair to begin reading this bill tomorrow after the Committee on Indian Affairs has completed its work. Perhaps more time may be desired for general debate before reading the bill. The bill can be read for amendment on Thursday and Friday, as we have nothing else on the calendar this week.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will there be any objection to continuing debate on the naval appropriation bill after the completion of the Calendar Wednesday business, if time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That was the suggestion made by the Chair, although no request has been made to that effect.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I do so for the purpose of calling the attention of the House to the fact that this measure and the hearings thereon have not been made available to the Members of the House until today, which I think is bad practice.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, is the intention and has been the intention of the chairman of the subcommittee and the acting chairman of the full committee that this bill be read for amendment on Thursday, and not before then. That has been the intention right along. Is that correct?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That is correct.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is mistaken with reference to the time for reading the bill. It was my understanding with the chairman of the subcommittee that the bill would be read on Friday, that we would not start reading the bill until Friday. If I am in error I should like to know that at this time.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. That depends upon the amount of time required for general debate.

Mr. DITTER. May we have the assurance that the bill will not be read for amendment until Friday?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Personally I have no objection.

Mr. DITTER. Then can we come to an agreement on that at this time?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. So far as the chairman of the subcommittee is concerned, the agreement is all right with me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] that general debate continue throughout the day?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of H. R. 8438.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 8438, with Mr. BLAND in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 30 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, it is with a feeling of some serious responsibility that I present this major appropriation bill to the House. My colleagues on the Committee, Mr. FERNANDEZ, Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts, Mr. CALDWELL, Mr. DITTER, Mr. PLUMLEY, and Mr. McLEOD, and myself, assisted by our efficient clerical staff, have spent many weeks on the hearings and in painstaking study of a large amount of pertinent economic and military data. We have been ably aided in every way in our hearings and studies by the personnel of the Navy Department who were assigned for the purpose.

The committee, in recognition of the superior economic strength of the United States, believes that a high obligation rests on the Nation to command the utmost means for its just defense. Civilization itself may be at stake. As a fundamental matter of national policy the committee further believes that in recommending appropriations for new capital ships that their size, speed, and armament should not be limited by principles of parity with other nations but that they should be made superior to any existing or pending construction insofar as this is practicable.

The naval appropriation bill for 1941 totals the sum of \$966,772,878, a reduction of \$111,700,000 below the Budget estimate. This figure sets a new record for peacetime proposals, exceeding the total appropriations for the current year by some \$51,000,000. This constitutes an increase of 5½ percent over the appropriations for the current fiscal year.

In justification of this vast expenditure, the first question that naturally arises is, "Whom are we going to fight?" The answer is, "Nobody, if the proper preparation is made and a strong, definite policy of defense is adopted."

Powerful currents of emotional opinion are today running against this policy in America; nevertheless, we cannot allow emotional opinion to be a basic influence in the making of defense appropriations. We are told that democracy is in danger. It certainly will be endangered by war. We must defend democracy by opposing war, unless forced upon us by the absolute necessity of defending the American Continent. It is well to now inquire into the proper limits of this defense.

The continental defense boundary was originally designed to be 3 miles from the shore line, this being the range of effectiveness of the best cannon of the time. In November 1793 Thomas Jefferson, then Secretary of State, informed the British Ambassador and also the French Ambassador that the President had instructed all officers under his direction, "that waters within our 3-mile limit were considered to be under the jurisdiction of the United States," but he specifically reserved the ultimate extent of our jurisdiction for future deliberations. The 3-mile limit is now certainly obsolete. Considerable testimony on the subject can be found in the hearings. It has evidently always been a definite national policy of Great Britain to leave her sea boundaries undetermined. By leaving them vague and ambiguous, the pretension to maritime sovereignty could be advanced and used as a political instrument when needed, and then relegated to the background without tarnishing the national honor.

The United States suffers from no such a situation. In my opinion, a delineation of the line of our responsibility is much needed, and the subcommittee commends the matter to the attention of the State Department. The continental shelf is suggested as such a line, as it bounds the source of nearly all of our sea-food supplies.

Basically, the present unsettled condition of world affairs, as well as the uncertainties facing our own Government, are essentially phases of the age-old and eternal struggle between the haves and have-nots. This never-ending contest happens to be in one of its most acute cycles.

Internationally the only ultimate adjustment seems to be through force of arms. The economic root underlying the vast expenditures and preparations for war, is the world-

wide demand for supplies of natural resources which modern civilization requires for national industrial prosperity.

This country is the richest in the world in the majority of these natural resources, as well as the richest in variety and quantity of food products. With only 7 percent of the world's population and 6 percent of the world's area we own or control nearly one-half of the world's raw materials. The United States cannot avoid the issue. It is part of our domain that is ultimately at stake. The United States is the world's largest producer, largest consumer, and largest distributor of these raw materials. Any approach to equalization with other nations means a shift of sovereignty on an unthinkable scale. Four-fifths of the world's industrial power lies on an axis extending in a comparatively narrow belt from Chicago eastward through central England and west central Europe, and most of the mineral resources of the world are tributary to this axis. The rulership of the world lies in the control of this industrial axis.

Before presenting the detailed naval estimates for the fiscal year 1941, I will further review briefly the background of events antecedent to this Budget.

In effect, let us step back until we can see the forest as distinguished from the trees. A longer view than political expediency is very necessary in considering this naval bill. From 1920 to June 30, 1936, the United States, in conformity with treaty obligations to its Allies of the last World War, Great Britain, France, Japan, and Italy, and under the terms of the naval treaties of Washington, 1922, and London, 1930, proceeded to maintain its naval position on a parity with Great Britain, on a 5-3 ratio with Japan, and on a 5-1.75 with France and Italy. In addition, the United States made certain political commitments in the Washington Treaty of 1922, which, in effect, permitted the other signatories already established in the Far East to fortify their positions therein, but, in the case of the United States, this right was relinquished during the life of the treaty. This concession, in retrospect futile and unnecessary, impaired our political position as an advocate of the open door in China and as being insistent upon equal trading rights in the area. It may be that it is in part responsible for the plight of China today.

It is well to remember that these decisions and commitments were made in the light of and closely after the end of the World War and upon the formation of the League of Nations. Internal politics at home played some part in the consummation of this political pact. Political leaders of the major parties in this country were unctuously bidding for the role of being the righteous, charitable, and bountiful doer of good deeds abroad with Government money and credit. The goose was hanging high, we were back to normalcy, the boom was on, why worry about the things that lay in the future?

But time marches on; the decade passed swiftly by, and in its wake, and due to the mistakes of the bountiful era, we now face the realities and the hardpan of the present.

Events have shown that, while the military and naval commitments of the past war treaties may have been well advised, only a hardy politician would dare to affirm the commitments of the Versailles Treaty or the Washington Treaty were well considered or that their consequences have eased the problems of the United States or any other nation in either international relations or in world trade. Commencing late in 1929, we began to produce a considerable surplus of cotton, oil, tobacco, corn, wheat, minerals, machinery, electrical devices and appliances, motor cars, tools, and textiles, and other things. There needs to be developed a market to consume these surpluses and, with foreign selling, there must be an exchange of money or goods. In the long run, there must be even a parity in all trade balance if the customer is to remain solvent. If there is an unfavorable trade balance with the buyer, there must be loans or capital furnished him from some source. To continue business we have found that loans to be profitable as an investment and paid at maturity must have adequate security.

The situation in Europe today has taught us that there also must be security for the very privilege of continuing national effort to profitably dispose of surpluses.

It is in the implications of this statement that we should view the Navy bill, and not in the political expediency of an election year.

Today many millions of people, including those of Italy, Germany, Japan, and even the Soviets, are governed by dictatorships. Aggression and conquest of weaker nations and seizure of their resources is as natural an expression of autocracy as the stalking of prey for food by predatory animals. Human history contains continuous record of such performances. The organization and employment of armies for effecting conquests appeals strongly to national pride and accustoms a people to severe regimentation, on the pretext of temporary necessity, while providing armed forces they cannot resist when later employed against them in suppression of domestic opposition. The law of survival of the fittest continues to rule the affairs of man, notwithstanding his efforts to raise himself above conditions which nature imposes on all living things.

Proposals for disarmament conferences and economic appeasements to stop war appear to be absolutely useless under present world conditions. The autocracies which have subordinated the individual to national needs cannot in any way subordinate themselves to foreign interests. Therein lies the element of greatest danger of destruction to civilization.

Events are taking place so rapidly that their implications are unpredictable. To review them: In 1931 Japan seizes Manchukuo; in 1934 Hitler seizes power, Germany rearms. In 1934 the Spanish revolution occurs, followed by civil war. In 1935 Mussolini's undeclared war in Abyssinia commences. In 1937 Japan's undeclared war in China takes the center of the stage. In 1938 Germany occupies Austria, then Czechoslovakia. In 1939 is the occupation and partition of Poland. Then Great Britain and France declare war with Germany. Russia exerts military control of the smaller Baltic states and in November 1939 invades Finland. A 5-year period of bloody struggles. It is well to bear in mind that every great power in the world, except the United States, is or has been at war in the last 5 years, and this year may see every power in Europe at war. There is no place for weakness in the totalitarian concept. Force is the only arbiter and the only court of appeal. In totalitarian theory, the seats in which you now sit are no more secure than your military power to defend them.

There is another type of reasoning often advanced in this Chamber. It is the one designed to create dissension and to oppose the interests of one group, class, or section to another. The subject of national defense cannot be viewed as a sectional matter. The support of the Navy is not the responsibility or of interest to the coastal population alone. I wish to emphasize that voting for the Navy bill is not voting against the laborer or farmer but for him. Labor and industry especially have always known and understood this fact. The labor group, organized and informed, has nearly always stood for national defense without regard to the party in power. The depression, if it has done nothing else, should enable the farmer to see that even the disposal of farm surpluses depends on markets and trade, and trade itself, in large measure, depends on the ability to hold our own when necessary in the field of world affairs.

Insofar as appropriations are concerned, the cut in the agricultural budget was relatively no more severe than the proposed cut in the naval budget. The Navy bill before you is not a product of militarism but a byproduct of the unrest in international affairs. It represents the concerted intelligent efforts of a bipartisan Appropriations Committee to preserve the mighty resources of our Nation and to keep the United States out of war.

Up to this year we have been engaged in an orderly building program designed to maintain our relative position as a world power. Under normal conditions our naval expense should have reached the peak by this time and then should have started to decrease had the war in Europe not broken out. As soon as the European war started the President strengthened the national defense by getting it ready for business and by asking for a revision of the Neutrality Act in

the special session of Congress. Ordinary precautions were taken. I am certain that they have the support of the electorate and were designed to keep us from aggression by being ready for eventualities.

This appropriation bill is designed to fully protect the Nation in any contingencies which may be reasonably expected to arise. In the report which accompanies the measure as submitted a complete analysis of the bill is given. Important features may be listed as follows: Naval appropriations for fiscal year 1940 amounted to \$915,360,249. Budget for 1941 was \$1,078,472,577. The bill recommends for 1941, \$966,772,878.

The summation excludes trust accounts amounting to \$2,430,000, which become available automatically and which are listed on page 37 of the report.

The estimates proposed a total strength of 152,000 enlisted men in 1941, and the committee has given careful consideration to this matter. The emergency supplemental bill provided a strength of 145,000 for the current fiscal year to man the additional vessels which have been put in commission in connection with the neutrality patrol, and the bill as reported makes provision for 150,000 in 1941. One of the deficiencies in our national defense has always been in the number of available trained men, and it appears highly desirable that we should increase the present strength of the Navy in order to provide training for as many men as possible. If a real emergency should occur and we were required to man every vessel to the limit on short notice, these additional trained men would be worth a great deal more to us in that extremity than the cost in dollars to the pending appropriation. The bill provides for a normal enlisted personnel of 125,000 as against 116,000 in 1940. This is on account of the new ships under construction, which will be placed in service during 1941, and may be laid at the door of the Expansion Act passed by Congress a few years ago. The additional number of 25,000 men is on account of the need for additional men in the neutrality patrol.

The Marine Corps has been provided with the strength of 25,000 men, as contemplated in the Budget estimate and as provided in the 1940 Emergency Supplemental Act. Of this number, 20,000, or an increase of 1,000, are provided for the normal strength and the additional 5,000 are provided on account of the emergency.

The Expansion Act of 1938 authorized a minimum of 3,000 airplanes by 1944, and the Navy will have available by July 1 of this year 2,863 planes. The procurement of planes has been proceeding at a much more rapid rate than necessary to reach the 3,000 figure by 1944; and, as a matter of fact, had the Budget estimate been approved in full, the Navy would have had in service or on order by July 1, 1941, in excess of 3,100 planes. The bill before you carries provision for planes to replace all planes which will have reached an age and condition during the year 1941 as to render them unsuited as so-called program planes, and also includes provision for 47 expansion planes for the Naval Reserve. The amount requested for 224 expansion planes for the Regular Navy has been deleted from the bill for several reasons.

In the first place, the Navy has found it necessary to reduce the training time at the Pensacola station from 14 months to 7 months in order to provide pilots as rapidly as required. Your committee is not convinced that this was a wise step. The planes being purchased by the Navy cost from \$60,000 to more than \$200,000 each. Every time a pilot takes one of these planes in the air, he is responsible for a considerable investment of the Government, not to mention the fact that he is responsible for his own and the lives of other Navy personnel. The greatest care should be taken to assure an adequate supply of sufficiently trained competent pilots, and the committee does not propose to recommend the purchase of planes over and above the present number if the too rapid expansion of the air arm of the Navy must result in sending those planes aloft in the hands of too hastily trained men.

The second factor involved is the question of obsolescence. It is no secret that frequently the various air services have purchased quantities of planes known to be of the very latest design and carrying the latest improvements at the time contracted for, but which were actually obsolescent upon delivery on account of new developments made in the meantime. Aviation is a new industry and is yet in its infancy. What the future may bring forth in the way of new designs involving range of operation, speed, fighting ability, and so forth, is wholly unknown; and it would not be good business for us to purchase a large number of planes for which we have no present need when we more than likely would find it necessary to scrap them and replace them with newer types when the emergency presents itself. In other words, there is no emergency confronting us at the present time which would require us to expand our air force beyond training and peacetime needs, and we might better save our money to spend on more modern ships when the need for them is in sight.

To consider a third factor, let us look for a moment at the capacity of our manufacturing establishments. It has been argued in past years that we should place orders for planes in order to keep our manufacturing plants in operation and have them in shape to produce large numbers of planes on short notice if we should become involved in war. A different picture presents itself this year. Our factories are in receipt of orders for large numbers of planes from foreign governments who are engaged in actual warfare. We can, therefore, look to these orders to keep our plants in operation and provide any necessary expansion of them and save this expense.

AVIATION

While no provision is made in the bill for purchase of expansion planes for the Regular Navy, there is included the amount of \$2,000,000 for purchase of planes in addition to the requirement for replacement and the 47 planes for expansion of the Naval Reserve strength. This amount is provided for the purchase of prototypes and other experimental craft, including those powered by Diesel motors. The war in Europe will no doubt result in many new developments in this field, and it is altogether possible that entirely new designs of aircraft will be produced. The Navy Department should have sufficient funds available to keep abreast of all new developments, and this \$2,000,000 for purchase of experimental aircraft, coupled with the appropriation for research and experimentation in aviation, \$7,500,000, ought to prove adequate for this purpose.

Autogiros and helicopters have never been extensively experimented with by the Navy. The Army is conducting experimentation with these two designs and is attempting to coordinate the work of all Government agencies in that field. No doubt there will be problems of a peculiarly naval aspect arise which the Navy should be equipped to investigate. Therefore in including the \$2,000,000 for purchase of experimental craft the committee has stated in its report that it desires \$50,000 of this money spent on autogiros and helicopters.

SHIP CONSTRUCTION

Another phase of this bill which is of general interest is the ship construction program, and this question has taken more of the time of the subcommittee than any other single question in the bill. We were confronted with the request for two additional battleships to be laid down in 1941 in addition to 22 smaller craft and for appropriations to continue work on 8 battleships and 89 smaller craft already under construction. The bill before you carries provision for all of these ships. The reductions which have been made by the committee and which are detailed in the report are based on a review of the requirements for carrying forward the program, and, in the judgment of the committee, these cuts will in no way impede progress of construction.

A major question considered by the committee was the type of capital ship to be constructed. Provision was made in the appropriation bill last year for two new capital ships, and it was contemplated that these ships would have a displacement of 45,000 tons. In reviewing this program in the light of later developments, the committee has inquired most minutely into

the characteristics of these ships as compared with those of ships being built by other countries. It appears, from the best information we have been able to secure, that these ships are just about the equal of foreign construction. As expressed in the report, it is the view of the committee that the United States, considering its leading position in the family of nations and its economic resources, not only ought to have as a national-defense measure but is in a position to build capital ships definitely superior as to speed, armor, and armament to any ship which we might be called upon to face in warfare. While provision has been made in the bill for continuation of construction of the 2 ships originally appropriated for in the 1940 act and initial appropriations are included for 2 additional capital ships to be laid down in 1941, it is the desire of the committee, as expressed in the report accompanying the bill, that the Department restudy the plans which have been prepared for the 45,000-ton battleships with a view to adding sufficient armor and armament and to increasing the speed of these ships to make them markedly superior to any known possible foe. Of course, these additions must mean increased tonnage—and let me point out that there is now no limitation either by treaty or by statute on the total tonnage, or on the speed, or on the armor or the armament of any vessel. We can build, under all existing statutes and treaty obligations, any size ship we desire, and I speak not only for myself but for the committee, which, after long deliberation, has arrived at a definite conclusion, when I express the view that we are practically wasting our money if we build vessels no better than those provided to oppose us when the expenditure of a small additional amount would give us a superior ship.

CAPITAL SHIPS

In considering the total tonnage of capital ships, consideration must be given to the cruising radius which a ship must have in order to meet the needs of the nation building her. For instance, Great Britain has many bases strategically located throughout the world where she maintains large stocks of fuel oil, ammunition, and other necessary supplies, and it is therefore possible for Great Britain to reduce the cruising radius of her ships below that which would be required of a United States vessel to operate on the same plane. This is a highly important factor as it enables Great Britain to reduce the tonnage of a ship which is given over to the storage of fuel oil and other supplies and use that tonnage in armor and armament. Therefore, a British battleship displacing 45,000 tons can readily be a more powerful fighting unit than an American ship of the same displacement. She may also be a faster ship than an American vessel of comparable size by the utilization of a part of this additional tonnage for horsepower.

Let me call your attention to a statement in the hearings on S. 2193 in 1937 in regard to the characteristics of battleships:

GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS

The fighting strength of a battleship is a combination of offensive power and the power of survival.

The offensive power depends upon the number and caliber of the guns carried. Battleships carry the heaviest guns that are mounted on any type of ships. The heaviest gun carried by any battleship afloat is 16 inches, and on ships of the maximum permitted displacement it is not possible to mount more than 8 or 9 such guns.

No modern ship, other than a battleship, mounts a gun larger than 8 inches.

If the London Naval Treaty of 1936 is ratified the size of the largest gun on battleships will be limited to 14 inches caliber, provided Japan and Italy accept this caliber before April 1, 1937. Should they not agree to this, the limit of size of guns on battleships becomes 16 inches.

By power of survival is meant the ability of a battleship to sustain itself at sea for long periods and to remain afloat and effective even after having received considerable injury.

The maximum size of battleships has been limited in former treaties to 35,000 tons, standard displacement, and if the London Naval Treaty of 1936 is ratified, this limitation in size will continue.

Because of its size, a battleship is able to carry the heaviest armor on its sides and its turrets to keep out armor-piercing projectiles that may strike in direct or glancing flight, and heavy and adequate armored decks to deflect the glancing blows from plunging shells and to break up the thin cases of bombs dropped from planes, so that they will spend their force in the open and not penetrate into the vitals of the ship. Protection from torpedoes and mines is obtained by adequate subdivision of the hull into small watertight compartments and by an elaborate system of pumping and drainage.

Size alone is a protection to a ship. One projectile or a bomb, or a torpedo, can carry only a certain amount of explosive. When the missile explodes it will destroy that part of the ship which lies within a definite radius. Consequently, the larger the ship, the smaller the proportion of her that is damaged by one shot. To illustrate the point, let us assume that the explosive in a missile will destroy 1,000 tons of ship structure. If the missile, then, should hit a 1,000-ton destroyer or submarine, it would destroy it; if it were to hit a 10,000-ton cruiser, it would destroy one-tenth of it, and if the same missile should hit a 35,000-ton battleship it would destroy one thirty-fifth of her. In reality, the larger the ship, the tougher she is—she has besides armor, heavier plating generally, and greater ruggedness throughout. The Battle of Jutland, fought in 1916, shows how much punishment a battleship can take and still remain afloat.

There were 28 British battleships and 22 German battleships engaged in that battle. Only one battleship was sunk, the old German dreadnaught *Pommern*. She was of only 13,200 tons, laid down in 1904, and hence her design was 12 years old at the time. The other 24 ships that were sunk were battle cruisers, which were much more lightly armored than the battleships of that day, and cruisers, and destroyers.

The British battleship *Warspite* in that battle received more hits from heavy-caliber projectiles than any other battleship. She received 13 hits. The battle was fought on May 31 and the repairs were completed on July 20, 50 days.

The German battleship *Koenig* received more hits than any other German battleship. She received 10 hits from large projectiles and was repaired by August 3, 64 days. No other type could have possibly survived such punishment.

The effect of damage by gunfire and by torpedoes in the Battle of Jutland was carefully studied by all nations, and all battleships designed since that battle embody the lessons learned in that battle.

The degree of protection afforded to the vitals of the battleship by armor is indicated by the small number of men killed in the battleships. The total number of British killed was 6,097, but only 123, about 2 percent, were killed on battleships. The total number of Germans killed was 2,545. The battleships suffered 948 killed, of whom 840 were on the one old battleship which was sunk by a torpedo, leaving only 108 from the other battleships.

The great size of the modern battleship permits her to carry a large number of smaller rapid-fire guns for defense against destroyers and an effective and large battery of antiaircraft guns and machine guns for defense against aircraft. Her size makes her a steady gun platform.

The cruising radius is the greatest of any combatant type of vessel, and it is capable of the greatest degree of self maintenance. It is capable of giving battle in practically any state of the weather or sea.

There is another provision in the bill which the committee desires to call to the attention of the Congress. This is a provision preventing the expenditure of any money from the appropriation for construction of new ships on ships which have been in commission more than 12 months. The practice of the Department in years past has been to take ships back into the navy yards for alterations long after the ships have been commissioned, and charge such alterations to new construction. It is not illogical to require that there be some check by Congress on this practice. In other words, there should be some date when a ship may be considered as finished. Two years ago the Congress included a provision in the bill prohibiting obligation of funds for such work after 12 months had elapsed from the date of commission. The provision, as written, has been more or less ineffective, as evidenced by the fact that the estimates for 1941 include \$5,522,521 for work on ships commissioned prior to July 1, 1939. The bill as presented carries the same provision in slightly amended form, prohibiting the expenditure of the appropriation for the construction of new ships for any work, including material, undertaken upon any ship more than 12 months after the ship has been commissioned. This provision is ultimately fair in that it allows the Navy 12 months from the time a ship is commissioned and taken out for trial runs to discover and rectify any errors in construction that may develop and to make any alterations necessary to provide a satisfactory ship.

RESEARCH LABORATORY

There is a real need for continued research and experimentation in naval problems, and the committee has increased the amount allowed for the Naval Research Laboratory \$250,000 above the Budget. The small amount to be spent by this laboratory—about \$650,000—will repay itself many times over in the new measures for national defense which will be developed by the laboratory. In years past this laboratory has contributed much to the developments in naval construction and armament and is at present working

on a number of very important problems for which adequate funds should be provided. The expenditure of sufficient money for research and experimentation should also result in considerable saving to the Government by reducing costs.

RESERVE

The Naval Reserve has not had the attention and support in years past which its importance in the national-defense program warrants. The committee has gone very thoroughly into this question, and it is our considered judgment that we can well afford to spend larger amounts in training the Volunteer Reserve, and we have, therefore, increased the appropriation for this purpose \$200,000 over the Budget. It will be noted that the Budget estimates include a considerable increase for the Naval Reserve, but this entire increase is to be applied to aviation, and it was the desire of the committee to provide additional training for the Volunteer Reserve, which would be called upon immediately in event of a threat of war. The policies of the War Department and the Navy Department with respect to the reserve forces have been directly opposite. The War Department has for a number of years encouraged and provided for a large Reserve army and has endeavored to keep that Reserve army adequately trained and sufficiently equipped to take its place in the battle line on short notice, whereas the Navy Department has not encouraged a large Reserve. As a matter of fact, the opinion has been expressed, and there appears to be some ground for it, that the Navy has actually discouraged expansion of the Reserve.

PUBLIC WORKS

The Budget estimates presented 55 new public-works projects to the Congress, and the committee has considered each of these items carefully, with a view to eliminating such as are not required or which might be deferred without serious consequences. There is no doubt that each of these projects would be well worth the cost and that each of them is needed by the Navy. However, faced with the necessity of reducing appropriations wherever possible, the committee has eliminated from the bill as reported all new projects which it appeared could be deferred for future consideration. This has resulted in a reduction of \$7,395,750 in the appropriation for these new projects. In addition the committee has reduced by 5 percent—\$1,800,775—the amount in the estimates for continuation of work on projects the construction of which was begun with prior appropriations. This cut will be applied by the Department.

One of the public-works items in the bill is a provision for improvement of harbors and channels in the fourteenth naval district at a total cost of \$3,000,000, with a cash outlay for 1941 of \$1,000,000. This work is proposed for the island of Guam. The work is necessary on account of increased air travel across the Pacific Ocean, as it is absolutely essential that American commercial planes make a stop at Guam, which is the only port of call open to American ships between Midway and Wake Islands and the Philippines, a distance of over 3,000 miles. The harbor at Guam has a number of coral heads, which should be removed in order to allow airplanes to land safely. In addition the harbor is frequently rough on account of swells coming in from the open sea, and a breakwater across the entrance to the harbor is necessary to provide a suitable landing area.

The bill as reported also includes provision for improvement of present water supply on the island at a total cost of \$325,000, of which \$125,000 is provided for in 1941. An urgent need for this water supply has been shown to exist, as at certain seasons of the year water rationing must be resorted to.

It has been claimed that any improvement in Guam will be taken as a hostile gesture by the nations in Asia particularly. I can see no such reason whatever. Guam is the property of the United States and has been administered by the Navy. Any improvements made there should properly and logically and economically be made by the Navy. The proposed improvements are only those things that are necessary to provide for the safe landing of our airplanes. The committee felt it would be taking a grave responsibility on its shoulders if it refused to vote for the appropriation for making this

harbor safe and there should be an accident involving the loss of even a single life.

Mr. Chairman, I have attempted to cover only the more important phases of this measure in the few minutes at my disposal. Detailed information as to the various items has been included in the report which the committee has submitted with the bill. [Applause.]

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The gentleman has stated that the committee could find in the report an explanation with regard to the reduction in the appropriation. I desire to call the attention of the gentleman to page 10 of the report. I have not had time to read the entire report, but I have read this far in it. It states:

In addition to these reductions, the committee recommends a reduction of 10 percent in the total remaining amount estimated for the two bureaus—

That is, Construction and Repair and Engineering.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The report continues:

This reduction is to be applied in the discretion of the Department.

Is the committee justified in reaching the conclusion that that is just an arbitrary reduction of 10 percent, because there is no explanation of how you arrived at it?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The committee was justified in making a 10-percent cut because we believe that the amount could be properly eliminated from the estimates in question. Due to the character and the large number of items concerned and the variable factors involved, it is almost impossible to detail the exact items in which cuts should be made. The general reductions in other major items certainly warrant similar reductions in these items.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does not the gentleman at least believe he should give the Committee of the Whole an opportunity to see how he arrives at the figure of 10 percent? It is rather unusual to say in an appropriation bill, "I will arbitrarily reduce this bureau 10 percent and then the bureau can administer the reduction."

Mr. SCRUGHAM. We thought it was desirable to do that because the estimate proposed large increases over current appropriations for general repair work. The Navy Department was not able to tell us exactly what they proposed to do with the appropriation, as they do not know what work may be necessary during the year. I might say this is one of those appropriations which will all be spent, whether we appropriate one dollar or a hundred million dollars. After careful consideration, the committee determined that 90 percent of the amount requested should be sufficient to meet all requirements during 1941.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes; but following that same line of argument, it would mean that the appropriation is so justified that you could not segregate it and bring about a 10-percent reduction.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. No. There is no other line of naval activity that contains such an infinite number of details as the items given in Engineering and Bureau of Construction and Repair, and the naval authorities themselves could make no detailed segregations. For that reason, instead of attempting the almost impossible task of taking each one of the tens of thousands of details and applying cuts, we thought we would leave details to the judgment of the authorities of the Navy.

After a full consideration of all evidence presented in the hearings, the committee is of the opinion that it will not cripple the Navy in any material way to make a reduction of 10 percent in these activities.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In view of the first statement of the gentleman about economy and the national debt and the desire to hold down appropriations, I was under the impression that because other committees are doing so, this committee just arbitrarily reduced these two bureaus 10 percent to help bring that about.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I would not say it was arbitrary.

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. DARDEN. Will the gentleman be kind enough to give us some information with regard to auxiliary fields requested by the Navy?

In the development of the Air Service and the Bureau of Aeronautics of the Navy the present regular naval aviation establishments are greatly overtaxed. To the end of expanding them, the committee last year authorized or recommended legislation which subsequently authorized the purchase of certain outlying fields that could have been purchased at very reasonable prices. The sum of money set aside for this purpose on both the Atlantic and the Pacific coasts was a modest sum. Our present facilities are not sufficient to take care of the planes of the fleet.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. As I recall, we had \$70,000,000 appropriated for aviation expansion last year. We have never had any complaint from the naval authorities that they were seriously handicapped with respect to lack of landing fields. To the best of my knowledge and belief the Navy is well provided for in the matter of landing fields, even though some of them are rented.

Mr. DARDEN. I am not talking about new stations, but the auxiliary fields for the stations. There was an item authorized of approximately \$70,000,000, which was not for large fields but small fields that are needed as outlying fields for the present stations.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Let us take them up one by one. At Pensacola they have Saufley Field and Corey Field as new fields. I think they have been purchased under the authorization, and to the best of my recollection they have other smaller fields.

Mr. DARDEN. And Felton Farms is being completed?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. The auxiliary field at Norfolk, I think, is rented, and the same applies to the auxiliary fields at San Diego. There is no provision for their purchase.

Mr. DARDEN. There are no auxiliary fields provided for at Norfolk or at San Diego. They were the two operating stations I had in mind.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I think they are taken care of by rental. Owing to the changing conditions and increasing landing speeds of planes, it is deemed unnecessary to go to large expense for auxiliary landing fields, which later may become obsolescent. The needs are now provided for by use of rented fields.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

To the best of my knowledge and belief these stations are all taken care of.

Mr. DARDEN. If it should develop that they are not, would the committee give sympathetic attention to going over the needs of both San Diego and Norfolk?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I do not believe there is such a great rush about purchasing auxiliary air fields. I have visited most of these places and have tried, to the best of my ability, to find out what was needed. I have never heard of any urgent need for auxiliary fields which was not provided for in some way.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. I yield.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. In the appropriation bill the last proviso prohibits any money from being used for the alteration of the 36 top-heavy destroyers.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Is that section 6?

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Yes. I am wondering if the House is to understand that while the defects exist in these destroyers, you are going to let them continue in that shape and not permit them to repair them?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. In the testimony of the Chief of the Bureau of Engineering and the Chief of the Bureau of Construction and Repair, in reply to questions of the committee, as to where the money was coming from to pay for the

restabilization of the faulty destroyers, they stated they had sufficient funds already appropriated for the purpose, and they further stated, and it is a matter of record in the hearings, they would not need any money from the pending appropriation bill. In order to make it perfectly clear that none of this appropriation was to be paid to rectify the errors that paragraph was included.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Then it is understood that out of supplemental money or other appropriations the money for this purpose is to be taken?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes; and there is testimony to that effect in the hearings.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. The other question I want to call attention to is with reference to limitation on expenditures on ships in commission. I thoroughly agree with your objective, but does not the gentleman think that the way it is worded it will force these contractors to go to the Court of Claims and no money will be saved whatsoever? I grant you that your objective is well founded, but I am simply apprehensive that you are going to force them all into the Court of Claims to file their claims for finishing out their contracts, because you provide a time limit.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. In answer to the gentleman's question, let me read from the report on page 8:

It does not seem illogical to provide some check by Congress on the length of time that money from the appropriations for construction of new vessels can be used on such ships after commissioning, and it certainly would seem that 12 months should afford ample opportunity to make all necessary tests and complete any incidental work required. The accompanying measure carries the provision quoted below in slightly amended form. The words in brackets have been deleted by the committee, and the words in italics have been inserted:

"Neither the appropriation 'Replacement of naval vessels, construction and machinery,' nor the appropriation 'Replacement of naval vessels, armor, armament, and ammunition,' shall be available for [obligation] expenditure for any [purpose as to] work of any character (including material) undertaken upon ships commissioned prior to July 1, 1939, nor as to any ship commissioned subsequent to such date after 12 months shall have elapsed from commissioning date."

We felt it was only good business to set some limit.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman entirely; but does he not think that the committee has set a limit of too short a time?

Mr. SCRUGHAM. No.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. From the information I have had on this subject, it will be at least 18 months or 24 months before all the claims are filed or before the matter can be finally adjusted.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Both the hearings of this year and of last year have been considered, and the mature judgment of the committee is that 12 months' time is sufficient.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I think the gentleman's judgment is probably too severe with respect to the length of time required.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I regret that I have not had more time to study the committee report and the hearings on this bill, but this is the way these things come to us and we have to make the best of it. I rise to make just a few observations in connection with the appropriations that have to do with the island of Guam. It seems to me that from a long-pull standpoint, we should do whatever is necessary in the way of providing equipment on Guam to facilitate the movement of passengers and freight by airships. While I voted against the appropriation in the bill that came up last session, I have in mind that I may support the proposition if there is a test vote in this present bill. I think that as we move closer to the independence of the Philippines that the people of the United States, as well as the Filipinos, will take on a more serious attitude insofar as naval and military defense of the islands are concerned. If the Asiatic war troubles continue and perhaps increase, as we move toward July 4, 1946, our people will have to reach definite conclusions as to whether or not we are to step out of the Philippines from

a military and naval standpoint, and let occur in the Far East whatever may take place as a result of our complete withdrawal, or reach conclusions as to whether or not we go back into the Philippines from a military and naval standpoint in the event a major far eastern power decides to move into the Philippines against the desires of the Filipinos, or with their cooperation. If the thought is in the mind of some of the Filipino leaders that we will furnish them military and naval assistance subsequent to their obtaining independence, that is something for the United States to become concerned about. On the other hand, if the Filipinos are in position to make their own economic situation work out satisfactorily, with whatever trade agreements they may arrange with us, or whatever trading arrangements they may bring into operation through the exchange of goods between the Philippines and the United States on a free-of-duty basis and at the same time take care of their own military and naval defense directly or in conjunction with some other foreign power, then that is something additional our people can well be concerned about. So it seems to me that this proposition with reference to Guam has something to do or, as a matter of fact, has directly to do with our present connection with the Philippine Islands, and also whatever connection we may desire to continue with, subsequent to the granting of independence, economically and politically.

It is from the Philippine aspect that I approach the fortifying of Guam when the question of fortification comes up; or if the question never comes up, then proceed with such commercial equipment as we desire there, and as we need, in order to maintain our air service between the Pacific coast and the Philippine Islands and our interests in China which our present foreign policy, so generously supported by the people, is now aggressively defending.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Before the gentleman leaves Guam, does he understand that this bill makes no provision whatsoever for the fortification of that island, but simply provides for a safe landing place by eliminating some coral reefs and building a breakwater, and that whatever we do here with regard to this appropriation, planes will continue to land there; and unless we take care of it in this bill to make safe landing places, lives will be lost and planes wrecked? It has nothing to do with military fortification.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what I understood.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. SUTPHIN. If I understood the chairman correctly, he said that the aviation activities there at the present time are largely commercial.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. That is correct.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Then is this not a subsidy for a commercial line if they are the only ones using it?

Mr. MICENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. MICENER. If that is true, why include this item in a national-defense bill? If it is a harbor development, that should come before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors. If the gentleman from Massachusetts has stated the matter correctly, certainly the item has no place in a naval defense bill.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I would not take exception to that observation.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I might say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICENER] that I think the Navy has the facilities much better than any other organization to take care of this type of project, eliminating coral reefs and deepening the harbor and making it safe. It does not make much difference what department takes care of it, it seems to me.

Mr. MICENER. Oh, it is very material as a matter of jurisdiction what department takes care of it. Rivers and harbors are looked after in the House by the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and the Naval Affairs Committee looks

out for our naval defense. It seems to me it is begging the question to say that it does not make much difference what committee has jurisdiction.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. I might say further to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICENER] that of course Guam is under the Navy. The Army has nothing to do with it. The Navy is equipped to take care of this work and can do it more economically than any other branch.

Mr. MICENER. But the Navy cannot do anything in Guam under its authority except it is used in connection with national defense.

Mr. SUTPHIN. If I might answer the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CASEY] the Navy did not do the actual work on the other stations. They gave it out under cost-plus contracts in Alaska and at Midway and Wake Islands. They were all private contracts. The Navy did not do the work.

Mr. MICENER. That would be the same thing here. The Army engineers and river and harbor engineers are far superior to any engineers of the Navy to develop a harbor.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Midway and Wake were not let out on contracts. They were handled by the Navy.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Oh, no. I have the name of the contractor who did the job.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, Mr. Chairman, we started out with the Philippines. For years we kept them under the War Department. Now we shift them to the Department of the Interior. Why they should be put under the Department of the Interior is beyond my comprehension, but that is the way we do things. Now here is a proposition where we are shifting the harbor improvements of Guam away from rivers and harbors to the Navy Department. The men who control these situations have reasons for them. I think it is perfectly in order for us to question those reasons. But, as I view the far eastern situation and our relation thereto, as tied in through the Philippine uncertainty and the Philippine problem, I do not become too technical on a point such as is now before us.

I approach Guam almost entirely through the Philippine gateway—what is our objective relative thereto? I am rash enough to make the statement that I think it is only a matter of time, and long before independence is granted under the present Independence Act, that you will proceed to fortify Guam on a big scale, and I think you will be giving serious consideration to the question of fortifying the Philippine Islands before we are out of them. It seems to me that is about the way things are moving in the Far East. To me it all ties in with our far-eastern policy.

Mr. MICENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. MICENER. Does the gentleman favor carrying out the Philippine independence law as it now stands, and getting rid of the Philippines, or is he in favor of our continuing to remain in the Philippines and fortifying the Philippines?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If the United States will proceed to give the Philippine Islands their independence in accordance with the present bill and wash our hands completely of all Philippine responsibility, economic, military, and from a naval standpoint, and keep the signatures of our officials off of agreements to the effect that we will guarantee and protect the neutrality of the Philippines, then I am in favor of our proceeding as now outlined. Otherwise, I reserve my opinion on the matter.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Do I understand the position of the gentleman to be that he is in favor of this Guam provision because he believes and understands it is a forerunner of the actual fortification of Guam?

Mr. CRAWFORD. No. I am somewhat in favor of it for two reasons. One is I think it is worth something to our country from the standpoint of national defense to have this clipper service which is now in operation, which we will call

a commercial service. And as we use Federal funds to subsidize other types of operation, both on water and on land and in the air, I am not so particular about the fact that we are subsidizing a commercial operation as now carried by whoever owns the China Clipper service or the Philippine Clipper service, or whatever it is called. It is all very closely connected with national defense. So, if we are to get completely out of the Philippines, kiss them good-bye politically and economically and from a military standpoint and from a defense standpoint—when I say “economically” I do not mean to treat them dissimilarly to what we treat other countries. I think they are entitled to as good treatment as we give the Cubans, and I will say even a little better than we give the Cubans. So I think that explains itself. I see no reason why we should not proceed to provide these commercial facilities at Guam.

Mr. RICHARDS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. The gentleman will admit that the purpose behind this thing is practically the same thing that was behind the authorization in last year's naval appropriation bill, which was defeated by the House of Representatives?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I think this is the beginning, with more to come.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes; I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. Is there not a considerable difference? This is for harbor dredging. A year ago it was for shore construction and a number of other things in addition to what is in this bill. This is simply harbor dredging.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I interpreted the gentleman's question as being very broad fundamentally when looking toward future development.

Mr. RICHARDS. I will say in reply to the gentleman from Minnesota, who is a very able member of the Naval Affairs Committee, that according to my recollection there is no difference. There is a difference in words, but last year's provision was for harbor improvements. This is for dredging the harbor. It was argued here in Congress last year that the harbor improvements in view at that time were dredging operations.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, to keep the record straight, last year's proposal did also include shore development, which is not included in this proposal at all.

Mr. RICHARDS. There is a provision just down below that does provide for shore development.

Mr. MAAS. Not in connection with the item that was in the bill last year.

Mr. RICHARDS. There is “water supply.”

Mr. MICHENER. Then if the gentleman is correct, the matter should go to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, because if there is no improvement except river and harbor improvement, it should go to that committee.

Mr. MAAS. They do not need an authorization at all. This is an appropriation. They need no authorization to do this harbor work. This is authorized under the general law for the fourteenth naval district. This is an appropriation.

Mr. MICHENER. I did not understand it that way.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 additional minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, going ahead with the other point which I wanted to develop and which to me has as much to do with national defense as do our Army and Navy appropriations, I wish to refer to some of the remarks in the President's address of last Saturday afternoon to the National Citizenship Institute of American Youth. I am quoting from the President's remarks as published in the Sunday Star. He said:

I have said on many occasions that the greatest achievement of the past 7 years in the United States has been * * * the awakening of many millions of American men and women to an understanding of the processes of their own governments—local, State, and Federal.

We know that the prosperity of the 1920's can properly be compared to the prosperity of the Mississippi bubble days before the bubble burst, when everybody was money mad, when the money changers owned the temple, when the Nation as a whole forgot the restraint of decent ethics and simple morals, and when the Government in Washington gave completely free rein to what they called individual liberty and the virtual ownership of government itself by the so-called best minds which wholly controlled our finances and our economics.

The President a little further on in his address, speaking of our exports, said:

Our exports for the calendar year 1932 were worth \$1,600,000,000. In 1939 they were worth nearly \$3,200,000,000, an increase of 97 percent.

He also pointed out that we have not solved the problem of old people, stating that the solution of the problem was evolutionary. He said:

We have made beginnings with the Old Age Pension Act, but we know that it is only a beginning and that through the next 10 or 20 years the system must be extended and improved. “Ham-and-eggs” and other plans will not do it because they are all open to the simple objection that they either print so much paper money that the money would soon be worthless or that the whole burden would be placed on the shoulders of the younger workers.

When the President made those statements he knew that since 1934 we have purchased, in round figures, \$10,000,000,000 worth of gold; and, of course, this purchase increased our export trade. Taking his own words, we know that his policy and the administration's policy has been to trade goods for gold, and that has been the great contributing factor to this increased export of goods.

The people went along with President Wilson when he traded goods for I O U's. In the last balance sheet of the United States Government published by the Comptroller General you will find a little over \$14,000,000,000 reflected in the balance sheet as assets which we accepted in payment of those goods. You can draw your own conclusions as to how much those I O U's are worth. Personally, I do not believe they are worth 1 percent of the valuation carried in the United States balance sheet.

Mr. Roosevelt supports the policy of trading goods for gold instead of I O U's, and as we trade goods for gold our exports increase; and so far as use by our people is concerned, the gold we are receiving for the goods is about as worthless, in my opinion, as the claims reflected in the balance sheet to which I have referred.

The President also knows that the British Empire consisting primarily of Canada, South Africa, and Australia, so far as gold is concerned, together with Japan and Russia, keep the trap baited with gold and the administration goes along with it. I hear you say: “If that is true, why does the President follow such policy?” Well, it is the easy way to do it, it is not the way out, but it is the easy way. We could trade our goods for critical and strategic goods we really need, such as tin, rubber, and coffee. We could even trade more goods to Cuba for the sugar we take from Cuba and pay them less cash, if we wanted to do so.

We could purchase investments in our industries which are held by foreign nationals, and thereby recover control of our own factories, mines, railroads, and utilities. But, the President goes the easy way—and by this I mean he buys gold through the banks and he does it in such a manner that the people do not understand just what is going on. But the President knows all about the details. He has experts who can keep him informed. He knows almost every major country in the world benefits through his gold-buying policy except the good old United States. Oh, yes; we place a high dollar value on gold; we stabilize the export dollar price; we guarantee prosperity to the gold-producing countries for all the new gold they mine and for all the old gold they dehoard or melt up.

He buys more gold we do not need; which we do not use; and as it grows in volume it takes away the earning power of the savings the old people have accumulated down through the years as they worked and economized and denied themselves the little luxuries they might have so much enjoyed, and all to the end that they would not be dependent upon the poorhouse when they approached the sunset of life.

Oh, yes; by bringing this gold in and financing it through the banking machinery it makes it quite easy for the administration, for the President, and so very advantageous to all the gold miners and shippers from other parts of the wide world. Individuals, at least not very many of them, do not have to be consulted for their private decisions as would be necessary, if we were trading goods for goods. By bringing the gold in through the banks it can be paid for with paper money (sure, with check money) and few people know what is going on. If real paper money (by this I mean currency) was issued and released into circulation in payment for the gold, millions of people would know about that and understand the transaction. And of course, many would say that is inflationary and must not be permitted. If too many said that, it would create political embarrassment for the President and his administration. But let me say to you with all the emphasis possible, such a method of payment for the gold that flows to us in unceasing streams would be no more damaging or destructive or dangerous than the very way the President is now financing his gold purchases. The President knows this also.

The President talks to the young folks about the welfare of the old people. He tells them about the low interest rates. He speaks of the great increase in exports and the rise in production. And while the President talks to the young folks, more gold comes in; paper dollars in the form of credits are issued therefor, the excess reserves of member banks rapidly rise, the banks demand more and more Government I O U's, the Federal debt increases, the Secretary of the Treasury says, "Government credit is at the top," the earning power of savings declines and the bondholders obtain a stronger hold on the people. These factors all have to do with the exports about which the President bragged—goods for gold.

The rate of interest, the earning power of investment, the earning power of savings accounts and insurance policies declines, and it becomes more impossible for those with savings to live on the lower interest rates which are paid, and the lower interest rates about which the President bragged last Saturday afternoon.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, we have made a great error in setting the price of gold at \$35 an ounce. The President makes a greater error in recommending that we continue the policy of buying more gold we do not need and cannot use. He knows it will encourage inflation to destroy the equities of our people of the middle and lower economic groups. The President understands our banking laws. He knows what a gold base of \$16,000,000,000 held by the 12 Federal Reserve banks would permit under present laws, if the money changers—the bankers—ever permitted their anxiety to make money to cause the credit expansion possible with this large gold base and operating under our fractional reserve system. About this, I shall say more at a later date. But once Federal Reserve notes are held lawful money to serve as a base or as reserves of the Federal Reserve banks for deposits held by them and to the credit of the member banks, the green lights will then be shining for an expansion of commercial credit and demand deposits of astounding sums. And, if Federal Reserve notes are not lawful money in the meaning of the Federal Reserve Act, just what kind of money are they? And if Federal Reserve notes can be issued at a ratio of two and one-half times the gold base held by the Federal Reserve banks, cannot there be issued approximately \$40,000,000,000 of such notes? If the \$40,000,000,000 of notes can be issued and if they are held lawful money, then what is to prevent the expansion of hundreds of billions of commercial credit if the bankers' judgment ever becomes distorted in the manner it did preceding the bursting of the Mississippi bubble and the days of the money changers referred to by the President in his Saturday afternoon address? Protecting price levels and the earning power of thrift and the equities of our people are as essential to our general welfare as are floating navies and standing armies.

As the President promotes policies which destroy the interest rates earned by savings, he strikes at the very heart of our private enterprise and capitalistic system. Is it rea-

sonable for us to assume investments in the form of stocks and bonds are to pay returns if those in the form of savings accounts and insurance contracts will not?

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. ANGELL. Is it not also a fact that there is a fictitious price on the value of gold of \$35 an ounce instead of \$20.67? Gold produced in Russia costs \$11 an ounce. This means we are paying the Russians three times what it costs them to produce their gold.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Chairman, I have been a Member of the House of Representatives for 9 years and I have never been so depressed since becoming a Member of this body as I am at the present time. Why have I become depressed? Is it because of personal reasons? Not at all. Is it because I am worried about this country? Yes, Mr. Chairman, that is the reason I am depressed now. I am deeply worried because if we proceed along the lines followed the past 5 years in connection with the operation of our Government it will eventually lead to our downfall. I cannot see a ray of hope unless we do differently from what we are doing at the present time.

No one is more sympathetic toward the proposition of taking care of the people of this country who need food, clothing, and shelter than I am. I will go to the limit in that respect, insofar as it is sensible and sound. But I believe that the people themselves should work, earn money, and save in order to be able to acquire the necessities of life and the happiness and enjoyment that goes with good healthful work. That should be the object of every individual citizen of America. I think it is the duty of the Government to see that our citizens have the opportunity and chance to work. The duty devolves upon the legislators of America, not only in the House of Representatives and Senate of the United States but in every legislative body of every State in the Union, to see that those advantages are given to its citizens.

But, Mr. Chairman, we have created bureau after bureau. We have permitted these bureaus to become so top-heavy and so burdensome that they will fall of their own weight—then the Nation itself will topple over. The very foundations of our Government will become unstable and our national life will be ruined. We will lose our present form of government and a dictator will follow. We have had 150 years of national life enjoyed by the American people. Now, we see an onward rush in the way of bigger bureaus and greater departments of Government, doing things and performing functions to an extent that, if continued, this Nation will be wrecked financially, and when we wreck the financial stability of the Nation the very form of our Government will be lost. If this happens, we will have a government such as we know not befall us.

After 150 years, America has shown itself to be the greatest Nation on the face of the earth. Mr. Chairman, we have been and we are going far afield of the intention of our forefathers. We are inviting trouble, and I make that statement in all sincerity. I have heard many Members of Congress make the statement, "Let us go on. Let us see what is going to happen. Let us repudiate our debts." The man who makes that statement has not very much backbone. He has a wishbone where his backbone ought to be. He has not the stamina that a good, sound American citizen ought to have, let alone a Member of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have quoted many times from various speeches made by the President of the United States, but I am going to quote again. I think this is one of the most sensible statements that President Roosevelt has ever made. This is taken from a speech delivered by the President in Pittsburgh, Pa., on October 19, 1932:

The credit of the family depends chiefly upon whether that family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation. If the Nation is living within its income, its credit is good.

If Government lives beyond its income for a year or two, it can usually borrow temporarily at reasonable rates. But if, like a spendthrift, it throws discretion to the winds and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy.

America is on the road to bankruptcy. It is not far off. Are we going to stop it? To give you concrete evidence of that fact, may I tell you that, at the present time, we have a national deficit, according to the Treasury statement of February 8, 1940, of \$42,219,115,506. Since July 1 last year we have gone in the red to the extent of \$2,437,133,055. We have heaped deficit on deficit during the last 10 or 12 years, yet we have as many unemployed men today as we had 10 years ago. We have been working hard trying to find employment for these people for 10 years, in Government service, but have not succeeded. Something is wrong. We should change the late laws. I could cite a lot of things here, but they might be interpreted as being political, and I do not want to be political today. I just want to be as sincere as I can, and I hope to have the hearty cooperation of the Republicans and Democrats alike in solving this problem.

One of the first things to do in this direction is keep our appropriations within bounds. Today we are asked to consider an appropriation bill for the Navy Department. Let me give you some of the increases that have been made in these naval appropriation bills during the last few years. In 1936 we appropriated \$432,859,729; in 1937, \$528,543,000; in 1938, \$519,320,000; in 1939, \$623,620,000; in 1940, \$778,488,000, in addition we had a supplemental appropriation of \$145,047,000. This made a total for last year of \$924,000,000. We appropriated for the Army last year \$874,876,000. This makes a grand total of \$1,798,400,000 that we appropriated for the Army and Navy. Think of that, Mr. Chairman—\$1,798,400,000 for the Army and Navy last year! I am not a pacifist but I believe we are going wild in preparation for war.

A naval appropriation bill is now presented to us carrying \$966,772,878, which is a larger amount than last year. I presume we will have a corresponding increase in the Army appropriation bill.

It is true that the world is in bad shape on account of war, but I question very much that the United States will become involved in that war over there if we do what we ought to do. We are not going to send any of our boys across the sea. I cannot conceive of anything that my happen in Europe, Asia, or Africa that would make it necessary for the United States to send even one boy across the sea with a musket on his back, or that would compel America to send its Navy over there to defend anything, because we have no possessions over there. I will give you my word now that there is no band that will make such good music, and there is no amount of oratory that will convince me I should vote to send our boys across the water. I just am not going to do it. And my reason is I am more interested in American boys and girls than in any others in the world and I am interested in the United States more than any other country in the world.

We have an item in the bill to improve Guam, near the Chinese coast. Let us give the island away before our improvement and fortification gets us into war. Let us stay away from Europe, Asia, and Africa in any possessions of real estate.

What are we doing in our other appropriations? We are trying to cut them below what we call the Budget or keep them within the Budget. However, when the bell rings at the end of this session I question very much whether we will not have gone above the Budget estimate in the sum total of our appropriation. Certainly we will be a billion over a balanced Budget.

I believe the Members of Congress have a better feeling and a better spirit today of trying to keep expenditures within bounds, but I question whether we have enough intestinal fortitude to say to some of our constituents back home when they ask for this and that thing that we do not believe our National Government should go any deeper in debt. I promise the Congress now that I will not agree to anything the people back home may want if I believe it is wrong and

will lead to our financial downfall, and I have tried to be conservative in that. I believe you, as Members of Congress, must be conservative, must possess business ability in spending as well as in taxation.

I have had the Post Office Department try to build post-office buildings in my district, where we have had good facilities, good post-office buildings which are rented, furnished, heated, lighted, and furnished with janitor service, by individuals at a cost the Federal Government could not match. If a post office were built it would be at an advance in cost of from 300 to 400 percent. That is sensible business procedure. I have gone down to the Post Office Department and told them I did not want those post-office buildings constructed, because I do not believe the Federal Government is in a position to do things like that now when there are other localities, which may not have such large receipts, where it would be better if the Government would build post offices there and more practical.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. I wish to tell the gentleman that in my city of York an annex to the post office is being built, and they have torn down one of the best post offices in the United States. They just have a wreck there that will cost the Federal Government about \$300,000. Every man in the city is damning the proposition as a reckless expenditure of money that no one can explain.

Mr. RICH. I am against extravagance and waste in Government any place. There has never been so much extravagance or so much waste as there has been in the last few years and as is going on right now in the departments. I have interrogated men from the departments in connection with the hearings on appropriations lately, and I find that these men who ask for funds for the operation of their departments are interested primarily in seeing how much money they can get out of the Government so they can increase the scope of their departments. When you ask them what they are trying to do to see where we will get the money back to help defray the expense of the department, they say, "That is not our function; it is the function of Congress." I have told these men from the Government bureaus who are interested only in spending—and I tell you now that they are only going to wreck their own jobs, because eventually the departments will fail; when the Government fails the departments fail—and then they will lose their jobs by virtue of the fact that their Government will be ruined.

When you think of the large number of buildings we are erecting, when you think of the added costs that will be placed on future generations of taxpayers, when you see our Government employees doubled in 7 years, when you think of the increase in the size of the Army and the size of the Navy—and I may say I do not fear any foreign country's coming over here to attack us—why should we do what we have planned in this naval appropriations bill right now?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 additional minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. We have in this bill and with what has already been authorized 10 battleships under construction. We will have 9 cruisers, 3 aircraft carriers, 50 destroyers, 26 submarines, 2 destroyer tenders, 3 seaplane tenders, large, 6 seaplane tenders, small, 2 submarine tenders, 3 minesweepers, 2 oilers, 3 fleet tugs, 1 minelayer, and 1 repair ship. Much other equipment, airplanes, and so forth, and so forth.

This morning I asked our Committee on Appropriations if anyone on that committee knew what the cost of upkeep of this Navy would be 5 years from now when these vessels are either completed or are still under construction, and nobody there could tell me. I have tried to find that out from the Government officials, but I cannot find anyone who will prognosticate or even give you an idea of what it is going to cost. I can see a great increase myself in personnel and expenses.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I consider the gentleman one of the most successful businessmen in this House, with one of the finest economic minds. I wish to ask him this practical question, man to man. The gentleman runs a business. I run a business. With our situation as it is this very moment, on what basis of fact can the gentleman or I or anyone else who really thinks, make an accurate forecast of the cost—I am talking about dollar costs and overhead expenses—of operating a large plant in the form of buildings, machinery, and concrete, or a large plant in the form of a battleship, 2, 3, or 5 years from now? On what basis of fact can one make such an estimate?

Mr. RICH. We have some idea of what it costs to operate a battleship now. Somebody could recapitulate the figures for these ships and give us at least a smattering idea of what it is going to cost to operate them.

May I say further to the gentleman from Michigan that I asked the Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to get the Committee on Ways and Means to sit down with his committee and talk this problem over. I have advised it in the House many times. The purpose is to get a well-rounded idea of what it is going to cost in a business sense to operate this Government, from the fact that we have gone on with this spending program of enlargement. Wise businessmen would do things in that way, and I think that we could have a better idea of the situation if we did that. We should know how much we have to spend before we spend it, or at least how we can obtain funds to spend. But if we go ahead and build and build and build, and it gets so topheavy that our taxpayers are unable to stand the load, and pay for the upkeep, the whole thing will topple over and we will go smash.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I appreciate the gentleman's position and agree with him; but we ask these gentlemen what this cost will be in dollars, and they cannot answer.

If we asked them what it would cost to operate this battleship in oil, in grease, in food, or in clothing for the men on it, and so forth, they could answer in quantity or in tons, but they could not answer in dollars, and here is one reason, if the gentleman will permit me to say so. We have at this very minute a legalized right for those who operate banks and lending institutions of this country to expand commercial loans and demand deposits to perhaps as high as several hundred billion dollars, and the only reason that is not put into operation is because these so-called money changers do not permit their judgment to go in that direction. Our great gold base is the cue to the potential credit inflation and price increase. The legal authority is in the banking laws of this country. Now, if the banks proceed to do that 25 or 50 or 75 percent, the dollar cost of operating these things may quadruple, quintuple, and sextuple, and these individuals know that, and that is the reason they hesitate to answer.

Mr. RICH. I will say to the gentleman that we have got to change a lot of laws we have on the statute books, and this may call for a drastic revision in our banking laws and in a manner giving us the gold standard and make our money stable and sound, so that we may know from what point we are going to operate on a long-term commitment basis and a good, sound business manner. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. DARDEN].

Mr. DARDEN. Mr. Chairman, I want to utilize part of my time in asking questions of the gentlemen on the Appropriations Committee.

The Navy Act of 1938 provided for an expansion of 20 percent in the naval forces of the United States. In order to take care of this expansion, it was found necessary to materially expand the yards and shore stations of the Navy. As I understand it, approximately \$25,000,000 is estimated by the Navy as the necessary cost, and I further understand that this sum of money has not been provided.

I wonder if any member of the committee would be good enough to tell me what is the reason or what is the plan of the committee in respect to this matter.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman restate his question?

Mr. DARDEN. As a result of the expansion contemplated under the 1938 bill, it was found necessary to expand materially the shore stations of the Navy, particularly the manufacturing establishments, because a great deal of this ship construction is being done in Government yards. It was thought that a minimum of, roughly, \$25,000,000 would be necessary in order to undertake this work. I understand this money has not been provided for any of the stations, and I am interested as to the plans of the Appropriations Committee in reference to the matter.

Mr. CALDWELL. The committee did not have before it an estimate from the Budget on those items, and for that reason did not go into the matter.

Mr. DARDEN. I understand it is true that the Budget did not approve the expenditure, but I think we ought to give very serious consideration to the matter.

Shipbuilding costs are high. They are going to continue high so long as our equipment is inefficient, particularly in our own yards. I am not prepared to say what the situation is in the private yards of the country, but it is my belief that the machine-tool equipment in the Government yards is sadly in need of replacement. I believe the necessary money expended for machine-tool equipment and enlargement of the manufacturing facilities of the yards can be saved and repaid within a space of a few years.

It is a very unfortunate thing for us not only to delay our shipbuilding program, but also make it more expensive by our refusal to appropriate the money necessary to put the establishments on an efficient basis to handle the additional work that has been placed on them within the last 2 years.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARDEN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MAAS. Does not the gentleman think that with this extensive program ahead of us, we not only would save a great deal of money in the ultimate cost, but would speed up construction considerably if we did modernize our tool equipment and the facilities for producing the ships?

Mr. DARDEN. There is not any question about it.

The navy yards have become, in the last 20 or 25 years, great manufacturing establishments. They are charged with taking care of the repair work incident to a large navy and with the building work that has been given to them since the Naval Act of 1934. We have not developed or improved our industrial facilities as we should have. As a result of this, the shipbuilding program is not only being delayed but it is costing too much. The money necessary to make these changes could soon be saved if we were willing to make the initial outlay.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARDEN. I yield.

Mr. CALDWELL. I believe there is a great deal in what the gentleman has to say. I think the committee, or certainly several members of the committee, is in accord with the views as expressed by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia. Furthermore, I believe it is the opinion of at least one member of that committee, speaking for myself, that we are not going to construct ships in this country at a minimum of cost until we decentralize that industry and spread it over a wider area.

Mr. DARDEN. I very much hope that some consideration can be given or that some further consideration can be given to this matter, because not only is the money not appropriated for the extensions made necessary by the act of 1938, but the authorization act now pending, which contemplates a further increase, will need additional shop equipment in order to make it effective.

There is another item that I want to touch on for a moment. In the expansion of our air stations we have failed to provide any auxiliary or outlying fields, not for the training stations, such as Pensacola, but for the great operating stations. We are sadly deficient in the fields necessary for the operation of the fleet. Let us take the Atlantic coast.

There are no air facilities on the Atlantic coast worthy of note. The Navy owns one field of approximately 125 acres of land in Norfolk, and that constitutes the sole operating base for naval aircraft on the Atlantic coast. It is true that we are building a station at Jacksonville, Fla., and we are shortly to start building one in the Narragansett Bay area, but it will be several years before these stations are finished, and when they are finished they will need auxiliary fields in order to make them fully efficient. I understand that the same thing is true on the Pacific coast. Last year we authorized auxiliary fields for Norfolk and San Diego and the cost was comparatively small, about \$700,000 for both of the items, and we have so far not been able to secure the necessary money.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARDEN. Yes.

Mr. MAAS. In addition to the value during peace times, is it not absolutely essential that we have these outlying fields in case of war, so that we can scatter our squadrons? You would not for a minute leave all your squadrons at a naval base.

Mr. DARDEN. That is unquestionably true, and the gentleman has had a good deal of experience of his own in that respect, because he has been in the air service and in the Reserve for a number of years. We cannot concentrate our air force on the Atlantic coast, as the gentleman knows, because we have not the facilities.

Mr. MAAS. And we cannot provide those overnight with the modern type of airplane. They have to be provided in advance of mobilization.

Mr. DARDEN. That is true. It is true that we are renting a number of fields, as the chairman of the subcommittee explained to us a short time ago. We are renting a number of small fields, but these leases can be canceled at will on either side and, in addition to that, the permanent runways necessary cannot be built under the law. We ought to acquire a certain number of additional fields. The outlay of money would be comparatively small. The use of the great bases in which we have invested millions of dollars depends to no small extent upon the availability of these small fields.

There is another matter that I want to touch on for a moment. I think we ought to face definitely this problem in reference to Guam. I think we ought to understand what we are about. When the matter was presented last year I said at the time that I was opposed to the fortification of Guam, and I still entertain that view, but I did vote for the measure before the House in the spring that provided for the improvement of the harbor at Guam. This bill carries an item of some three or four million dollars looking to harbor improvements in the island. They are necessary if the harbor is to be fully utilized, but the real problem we will be faced with in this House in less than 3 years more is whether or not we are going to change our policy with reference to the Philippines. That is a most important matter which we have to consider. There is a strong movement on foot here—many of you are familiar with it—looking to the guarantee by the Government of the territorial integrity of the Philippines with the local government left entirely in the hands of the officials of the islands. That will commit us to a tremendous venture in the Far East. We will be saddled with the burden of providing military establishments for the Philippines that are located in a dangerous part of the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. DARDEN. I do not think I could use that much time.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARDEN. Yes.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he is opposed to fortifying the Island of Guam?

Mr. DARDEN. I was very much opposed to it last year, and I am inclined to think that I would feel the same way about it now.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Guam is surrounded by the Japanese-mandated islands, is it not?

Mr. DARDEN. I do not know that it is surrounded. It is very close to them.

Mr. SUTPHIN. And we have seen Japanese planes flying over Guam, and they are of such type that they could have flown from the mainland of Japan.

Mr. DARDEN. Yes; I expect it is close enough to the Caroline Islands to be in range of aircraft operating from bases on those islands.

Mr. SUTPHIN. And no one has ever contended that we could hold Guam in the event of attack.

Mr. DARDEN. Oh, no. I think the gentleman is mistaken there. I believe that if we were willing to go to the tremendous expense of fortifying Guam it could be made practically impregnable.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Yes; at a cost of half a billion or seven or eight hundred million dollars.

Mr. DARDEN. It would be a costly undertaking; it would run into the hundreds of millions of dollars.

Mr. SUTPHIN. And the gentleman does not think that we could hold the Philippines, in the event of attack, for more than 20 minutes.

Mr. DARDEN. No; but I think it would be easier to hold Guam than to hold the Philippines.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, would the gentleman yield there to permit me to ask a question of the chairman of the subcommittee?

Mr. DARDEN. Yes.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. I call the attention of the chairman of the subcommittee to the fact that in his report he says that \$50,000,000 for the replacement of naval facilities is made immediately available. I fail to find it anywhere in the bill. I am inclined to think it was an oversight.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. It is a typographical error and should be corrected.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. It is important that an amendment be offered to correct that when that item is reached.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARDEN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SUTPHIN] observed that even if we fortified Guam we could not hold it. It was never contemplated by the Navy Department that even the fortification of Guam would enable us to hold it indefinitely, was it, but that such improvement as they wanted for Guam would enable us to delay aggressive action toward the United States, and that that very delay would serve the strategic purpose of improving Guam? Was that not the idea?

Mr. DARDEN. I believe that was the testimony of all the officers who appeared before the Naval Affairs Committee.

Mr. MOTT. I wish the gentleman would clear up a statement made on the floor a moment ago by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who said it was impossible to find out anything about what it was going to cost to operate the Navy. In the gentleman's long experience on the Naval Affairs Committee and his contact with the Navy Department, I think the gentleman is familiar with the fact that the Navy Department can tell us now what it is going to cost to operate the Navy this year, and from their experience they can tell what it has cost from year to year, and from their experience they can give us an estimate sufficiently accurate to satisfy any businessman what it would cost to operate the Navy in the year to come.

Mr. DARDEN. I think that is true, because if my recollection serves me correctly, the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT] asked the officers recently appearing before the Naval Affairs Committee that question, and they were able to tell us, roughly, the cost of operating a battleship, a cruiser, and the lighter ships.

Mr. MOTT. I thought such an inference as was made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] should not go unchallenged.

Mr. DARDEN. I think the gentleman from Pennsylvania was mistaken in that.

Mr. SUTPHIN. I asked Admiral Stark that question, and he put in the hearings the cost of operating battleships, carriers, heavy cruisers, light cruisers, destroyers, and submarines.

Mr. DARDEN. There is no question in my mind on this point, and that is, if we are going to fortify any place in the Far East, the fortification ought to take place at Guam as a military matter, because, in the first place, the Philippine Islands are difficult to defend. In the second place, they are people who want their independence and to whom we promised independence. For my own part, when 1946 comes I hope we will wish them well on their way. I do not want to see the United States involved further in the Philippine Islands, particularly when the Filipinos themselves want to be free. If we want to attempt to protect by force our trade in the East, the pivotal point is the island of Guam. That is the place to fortify if we determine to take that step, and not the Philippine Islands. With Guam strongly fortified, the Philippines would be protected if we wanted to take that gamble. I do not want to do it. I do not want to assume responsibility for the Philippine Islands beyond 1946. When that time arrives I want to see them go on their way as provided now by legislation.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARDEN. I yield.

Mr. MAAS. I think I would go along with the gentleman on his point of view, but does the gentleman honestly think that when we cut the Philippines loose in 1946 what they are going to get is independence?

Mr. DARDEN. That I do not know, but I think what they are going to get from us is independence. Whether they will get it from the rest of the world I do not know. But I am not willing to see this country committed to protecting the Philippines indefinitely in the future. When their independence is given them in 1946 I want to see our obligations in the Far East terminated as far as they are concerned.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARDEN. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. Now, suppose we do give the Philippine Islands independence in 1946, as has been proposed by this Congress; does the gentleman contend in that event that Guam should be fortified?

Mr. DARDEN. No; I have not contended that at all. I say that if we want a military outpost in the Far East, Guam is the place to fortify, even if we retain the Philippine Islands.

Mr. RICHARDS. Philippines or no Philippines?

Mr. DARDEN. Philippines or no Philippines. If we are going to do any fortifying in the Far East, Guam, is the place to do it, but I do not believe that that fortifying is necessary. I think the harbor at Guam should be developed for the use of our own ships and our own people, but beyond that I see no reason for us to go at the present time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARDEN. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Does the gentleman believe the Philippine Islands will take their independence in 1946?

Mr. DARDEN. I think they will, but I am not an authority on that matter. I have never been a member of the committee dealing with those affairs, and I was not a member of the group that went to celebrate the beginning of their independence a year or two ago. I am not sufficiently familiar with what their representatives want.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I may be wrong on this, but my understanding is that it is not obligatory upon the Philippine Islands to accept their independence at that time. I was wondering how the gentleman felt, as to whether or not they were going to accept their independence.

Mr. DARDEN. We had some discussion of that a year or two ago. I think it involved a point that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] brought out. My recollection is that it is obligatory, and when the time is reached they must accept their independence, unless by legislation we alter the situation.

Mr. MAAS. That is right.

Mr. DARDEN. Now, that is the work that is going on here in Washington right now—a determined effort to have us review this situation and to again assume or continue sponsorship of the Philippines. If that is going to be done, if this Congress is going to continue to sponsor the Philippines, then Guam ought to be fortified now.

It will cost \$300,000,000 or \$400,000,000, but this step ought to be taken now if we are after 1946 to continue to sponsor the Philippine Islands, for we shall need it.

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. DARDEN. I yield.

Mr. RICHARDS. And the gentleman will admit that this country time and time again has reiterated its promise to the Philippines to give them their independence; and the Philippines time and time again as a people have stated that they wanted their independence.

Mr. DARDEN. I admit it, of course, and I am for it; I am for the legislation that is now on the books. I think the Philippines should be given their independence, and I think we ought to stand by the present legislation.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DARDEN. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. Up until 1946, or at least until such time as the Philippines have become independent, it is obligatory upon us to defend them, is it not?

Mr. DARDEN. I understand it is; yes.

Mr. MOTT. And if in order properly to defend them a further improvement of Guam is necessary, why not do it now?

Mr. DARDEN. I think the improvements of the harbor of Guam ought to be carried out regardless of the defense item. I think the sum asked by this committee for the improvement of the harbor there is necessary, for navigation is almost impossible there on account of the coral heads. I think this work ought to be undertaken, and I believe the Navy is in better shape than anyone else to undertake it.

Mr. MOTT. I have often felt that were it not for the fact that Japan is pretty well tied up now in China she might not wait until 1946 to make a move against the Philippines.

Mr. DARDEN. That may be true. Another factor which accentuates the difficulty in reference to this matter is the present very general talk in our own country as to an embargo against Japan. Whatever may be the gentleman's sympathies or my sympathies—and surely mine are all with China—I believe the minute we make the final, irrevocable decision to embargo Japan we shall be dangerously near violence in the east. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, the question of fortifying Guam was discussed a year ago when this appropriation bill was in the House. Many Members opposed the appropriation asked for at that time for the purpose of fortifying Guam. I hope that as the debate goes on in the House this week it is made clear that the item carried in this bill is not an item for the fortification of Guam, but simply one to improve the harbor of Guam, something that should be done whether or not we ever have need to fortify the island.

This appropriation is necessary not only to protect the rights and property of the United States Navy but for the benefit of our civilian flyers who are doing such a fine job in developing civilian aeronautics in this country and flying the Pacific in the well-known clipper ships.

I have been particularly interested in the subject of national defense, certainly for the last 23 years, and I regret that at a time like this when we are considering a bill calling for the expenditure of more than \$1,000,000,000, relating to the very existence of our country, a large number of Members are not on the floor to participate in the discussion. There was a time a few short years ago when it seemed we were in danger of neglecting our national defense. Pacifist organizations, many of them very sincere, and other organizations with the desire to see the defenses of the United

States weakened were getting in their work to such an extent that the Congress and the country were not paying the attention they should to this question and problem of national defense. This has all been changed within the past 2 or 3 years, as war has broken out abroad, and I think perhaps we have reached the point now where we have got to be sure that the pendulum does not swing too far in the other direction, that we do not appropriate too great sums of money for national defense. It seems to me it is the duty of our General Staff and our naval officers to bring to the Congress, to the Committees on Naval and Military Affairs, recommendations and suggestions that would enable us to provide for any eventuality that might arise. These experts of the Army and the Navy having pointed out to the Congress the actual and very remote possibilities of what might happen, it is then the responsibility of Congress to decide how far they wish to go in following the recommendations and suggestions of the War and Navy Departments. Once in awhile it is said on the public platform, and it has been intimated on the floor of this House, that the high commands of our Army and Navy have a desire to so expand these branches of our service as to create opportunities for promotion.

I think that is an unfair statement to make. I have confidence in the officers of our Army and Navy, believing that they sincerely try to present to the Congress the problem as they see it and that they make requests for what they think is necessary so that this country may be in position to protect itself.

When I returned home from the World War I vowed as one private citizen that I would do my best to see that never again would the conditions existent here in 1917 be allowed to exist at the outbreak of some future war; that never again would the young men of this Nation be drafted into the military service of our Army and sent into battle with such little training that they actually did not know how to load the rifle given to them, and that did actually happen in 1918. I have it on the authority of a fine friend of mine who served as a commissioned officer in one of the combat divisions, who told me that early one morning in making a tour of inspection he came across a young fellow who had been sent to that outfit as a replacement just about an hour before that unit was scheduled to go over the top. He had known this young man in civilian life and stopped to exchange greetings with him. The young fellow in response to his question as to how he was getting along said, "Fine; but I wish there was somebody around here to show me how to load this darn rifle before I go over the top." Such conditions should not be permitted to exist. I want to make sure that never again, if this country must defend itself, will our young men be called upon to fly in what has been properly termed "blazing coffins."

Now is the time to experiment, to carry on research, to acquire the very finest type of military aircraft that money can buy. Now is the time to establish a training program that will give us the military and naval pilots we may need in case we are subjected to an attack. At the present time we are in danger of having our building program develop so rapidly that we will not be in position to provide adequately trained pilots and properly equipped airports for this rapidly expanding air force for which we are providing in this bill.

During the congressional recess I had the opportunity to visit some of our military and naval stations in Panama. I was rather shocked to learn from a pilot stationed in Panama—in fact, from the commanding officer of one of the squadrons down there—that between October 8 and December 8 of this past year we had lost, either in Panama or en route to Panama, 10 military and naval pilots. It is interesting to note that every one of those 10 pilots who died either on his way to Panama or after reaching Panama was a Reserve officer called back into the active service. Men were sent down there to fly ships that were 100 to 150 miles an hour faster than they had ever flown before. The thought was expressed by that commanding officer—and I know those who are familiar with the subject agree with him—that no pilot should be permitted to fly a fast pursuit ship with less than a thousand hours in the air. We do not want to send men into mortal combat again in pursuit planes with only 35 or 40 hours of flying training and an inadequate ground schooling.

At the time this Congress had the civil aeronautics training program before it we provided in the bill that at least 5 percent of the young men to be trained under this program should be selected from young men without college training. I offered that amendment and was happy to see it adopted. I have been interested to follow through and see how it worked, and I have learned recently that the Civil Aeronautics Authority is very well pleased with that provision; in fact, it would be perfectly willing, in view of its experience of the past few months, to have that 5 percent increased to 10 or even 15 percent. We have many young men in this Nation who have grown up since the development of aviation, who have played with model planes, who have built model planes, who have saved their pennies and have secured flying training. They are adequately equipped to enter not only the civil aeronautics courses but to go into our Army and Navy and secure flying training. I wish that the Army Air Service and those in charge of our naval aviation would give serious consideration to letting down a little bit on the requirement for flying training in the military and naval service. At this time, when that program is expanding so rapidly, it seems to me quite simple to segregate a group of possibly 100 or 200 student pilots selected from those without college training, put them through the regular military and naval courses, and learn from actual experience how their work compares with those that meet the strict requirements now in force by our Army and Navy. Several of our World War aces, men like Rickenbacker and Luke, never went to college.

I have referred to the danger, and I think it is a danger, that our building program will proceed so rapidly that we will not keep up with our personnel-training program. Reference has been made on this floor to the lack of airports along the Atlantic coast. I think everyone who has looked into this subject will agree that we have to start right now making adequate provision for these planes that we are building to land somewhere along the Atlantic coast. In connection with the development of our Air Corps nothing is more important than the procurement of aircraft and the training of pilots.

Last June, in fact, to be specific, on June 27, the gentleman from Illinois, Hon. RALPH CHURCH, addressed this House on the subject of transferring from the Atlantic and Pacific coasts to some inland point our munition and aircraft factories. A hasty reading of that address might well convince Members of the House that there was something to the idea, but I believe it is a move that should be very seriously considered before any such recommendations are made. Perhaps I have a selfish interest in this matter in that I have two or three of the larger units of the aircraft industry in my county. But I say to the members of the committee that if I honestly believed it would be to the advantage of our national defense to move the aircraft industry from Connecticut to, say, Illinois, I would very gladly vote to move that industry to Illinois. However, a careful examination of the facts, in my opinion, will convince any Member of the House that the suggestion is neither a practical one nor necessary.

Each Member of this House represents a constituency in the various States and we are all proud of certain achievements of the citizens and residents of our district and of our State. I know that the citizens of Connecticut would not for a moment think of trying to compete in raising wheat or corn with those residents who live in the Corn Belt and wheat-raising areas. While each part of this great Nation is particularly adapted to certain activities, agricultural or industrial, we feel that we have a certain peculiar qualification for the building of aircraft and the manufacture of fine tools in Connecticut.

In the first place, I do not believe that if the Government of the United States wanted to it could succeed in transferring the aircraft industry in Connecticut to, say, Illinois, because we know from experience that while it might be possible to move the machinery and some of the executives, the skilled mechanics who are working on these motors and on the aircraft, judged from past experience, would refuse to pull themselves away from their homes and move to another part of the country.

We saw that tried when the automobile industry was developing in this country. I was interested to learn recently that while we at one time had several automobile manufacturers in Connecticut they have since then moved to the great State of Michigan, but I find that the persons who then worked in those factories are still in Connecticut and still working in the same factories. They have simply turned their attention to new products and new equipment they can manufacture.

Our colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] in his remarks last June emphasized the danger of aerial attack on the aviation factories in this country. It may be interesting for the members of this committee to consider the fact that if we take the 10 most probable points of attack by air, that is, by the locating of an enemy airplane carrier, Chicago, Ill., is closer to the probable point of attack in 5 cases than is Hartford, Conn. To be sure Hartford, Conn., is equally near the probable point of attack in 5 other cases. I shall not mention the locations I have in mind as I believe we are on rather thin ice when we start to discuss points of attack on the United States, but taking the 10 most likely points of attack we find that they divide 50-50. We cannot put a great deal of weight in the suggestion that the East or even the Pacific coast is more likely to be subjected to attack from the air than is Illinois.

I have referred to the necessity of having skilled mechanics to manufacture and build our aircraft. Recently a manufacturer of national reputation employed a firm of industrial engineers to make a survey of several different parts of the United States with the view to building a new factory, the factory to be equipped to build a very necessary part of an aviation engine. This group of industrial engineers surveyed several States of the United States and then made their recommendation to the manufacturer who engaged them.

Among other things mentioned in the report was that the industrial engineers found that Connecticut has the largest supply, generally distributed, of skilled labor in the United States. The following shows for a number of States the number per square mile of workers in certain machine- and technical-product industries requiring skilled labor:

Per square mile

California.....	0.17
Connecticut.....	13.69
Illinois.....	1.53
Maryland.....	.25
Massachusetts.....	6.27
New Jersey.....	5.29
New York.....	1.53
North Carolina.....	.01
Ohio.....	2.10
Pennsylvania.....	1.66
Virginia.....	.02

This same firm of industrial engineers, having ascertained from experts on defensive tactics against aircraft the ideal type of territory to defend, stated in this report that of all the places studied in the plant survey, the central part of Connecticut appears to be closest to the ideal:

(a) There are a number of moderate-sized industrial cities. Hartford, the largest, has 170,000 population. (b) The country is generally wooded and hilly. (c) Motor roads radiate in all directions, affording ease of access and no transportation bottlenecks. (d) A number of the cities have relatively important industrial plants situated in their environs, warranting all-around antiaircraft protection. (e) Some of the cities are far enough from the coast line to be safe from landing raids, bombardment by naval guns, or unheralded attacks from carrier based planes. (f) A location in the environs of any of these moderate-sized cities would enable providing the plant with its own power, water, and sewage service.

I mention these figures simply to indicate that more is involved when we consider transferring either the aviation industry or any other munitions industry from its present point of location to a possible point in the Middle West. Further, we have no assurance and we have no reason to believe that if this country is ever subjected to an attack from the air, the attack will come from the North Atlantic or from the Pacific or from the Gulf of Mexico. While we have a very friendly neighbor to the north, we do not know what the years will bring and we do not know but that if we

transfer these important industries from the Pacific coast or the Atlantic coast inland to, say, Illinois, we may not be putting them very close to the probable point of attack.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman know of anyone besides the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] who is seriously considering such a proposal?

Mr. MILLER. I hope no one else is seriously considering it, but sometimes statements such as this are made and implanted, possibly, in the minds of members of committees. I know that some of our magazines have taken up the theme. I hope those who have the responsibility will not be carried away by the enthusiasm of a Member to attract a mighty fine industry to his district.

Mr. THOMASON. I believe the gentleman is attaching undue importance to the suggestion, because I do not believe anyone is seriously considering it besides the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MILLER. I hope not. Still you cannot blame him for wanting to attract such an industry to his district. I believe that as long as that point has been raised, I may be excused if I say that I am mighty proud of the men who make up our aviation companies in the State of Connecticut. I know the same is true throughout the United States.

Aviation has been referred to more than once as a young man's game. It is certainly a comparatively new industry. They have had the misfortune to have to make most of their development in a period when all industry has been suffering from depression. I have often wondered where that industry would be today if it had not had to contend with the depression that has been world-wide.

I referred some time ago to taking advantage of lessons that we learned during the World War. I hope that with that thought in mind I may refer to a matter I believe is important and is concerning many of our citizens. Certainly it is if I can judge from the mail I have received.

I would hate to see the United States follow the paths it followed between 1914 and 1917, particularly those paths that led to our involvement in the World War. Like most Members of Congress, I know only what I read in the paper, but I have read of the sending of our First Assistant Secretary of State to Europe as the personal representative of the President. It is only natural and reasonable that sending Mr. Welles on this mission is bringing to mind that we had a like experience during the World War, when President Wilson had an unofficial observer in the capitals of Europe. I hope the President or the State Department will see fit to set the minds of our people at ease and take them into his confidence, insofar as he can, and convince them that this is not a similar mission to that on which a special representative of President Wilson was sent in 1915 and 1916. And while I mention that subject, those of us who are interested in providing an adequate national defense are naturally interested in the development of our merchant marine, and we regret that it is necessary, in order to protect the best interests of the United States—at least, that was certainly the opinion of this Congress—to enact a neutrality law that took off of many of the seas our merchant marine; and while the activity of the merchant marine is curtailed, certainly it is doubly important that every possible support be given to those vessels of ours that are still traveling the high seas, and I regret that this special envoy of the President to whom I refer has seen fit to start on his mission and go to Europe traveling on a foreign vessel. I know the answer may be that the *Manhattan* was not due to sail for 4 or 5 days after he decided to sail for Europe, but if it was urgent that this special envoy get to Europe as quickly as possible, we have, flying the American flag, aircraft that would have gotten him over there in less than 36 hours, and I hope that in the future every representative of our Government and every one of our citizens who finds it necessary to go abroad, as patriotic citizens, will try to use the vessels of the United States merchant marine.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. I will be very pleased to yield.

Mr. THOMASON. I am always very much interested in what my friend has to say on the subject of national defense, and I am in hearty accord with the suggestions he has made about the improvement of our own Army and Navy. I think we belong to the same school of thought, and that is that neither of us wants the largest army in the world, but we want the best; and in view of what the gentleman has to say about the need of more and better munitions and of a more adequate army as to personnel and as to housing, and, particularly, as to a strong air force, does not the gentleman think that, in view of the economy wave which seems to have struck Congress, we might well postpone any improvements at Guam until we have taken care of our own internal national defense, and until it is determined whether or not the Philippines are to have their freedom in 1946?

Mr. MILLER. If the appropriation carried in this bill was solely for the benefit of the Navy and for naval pilots, I would be willing to say I agree with the gentleman. I voted against this appropriation last year, frankly, under misinformation, as I now know; but I have been told on certainly reliable authority—and I think there is no secret about it, from the Civil Aeronautics Authority—that this is an important improvement if they are going to develop trans-Pacific flying.

Mr. THOMASON. Every appropriation bill that has come into this Congress has suffered very severe cuts. The gentleman has mentioned the merchant marine, which I think was unduly cut; and in view of what my friend and colleague from Texas [Mr. JONES], the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, had to say, agriculture has suffered more than any other branch of the Federal Government, in that it has been cut, I think he said, 51 percent. Now, if we must have cuts in these appropriation bills, including the appropriation for the War Department and likewise for the Navy Department, does not the gentleman feel that we had better use such money as we do appropriate for further national defense for the upbuilding of our Army here in the United States and Panama, Hawaii, and Alaska, and postpone the consideration of any improvements at Guam for the present, or even until it is determined whether or not the Philippines are to have their independence in 1946? Does not the gentleman feel that would be a wise policy in view of our economy program and the apparent demand for economy?

Mr. MILLER. I would be perfectly willing to vote to strike that item out of the bill in view of the fact that cuts have to be made and we have not had an opportunity to study the hearings. I do not know just how substantial the cuts are that have been made by the committee, but I will say this to the gentleman: In my enthusiasm for national defense I do not want to vote to appropriate a single unnecessary dollar. I think we have got to make these small cuts in order to acquire a large saving, and it is possible a study of the hearings and the bill itself will lead the House to believe that we can go further in cuts than the committee has gone.

Mr. THOMASON. It seems certain that we must have some cuts, and if we are to have any priorities, does not the gentleman think that we need to build up our own Army and its personnel, its equipment, its housing, its airports, its airplanes, the Navy planes and the Army planes, the fortifications at Panama, Alaska, and Hawaii, before we branch out in another venture in the Far East?

Mr. MILLER. I certainly do, and I commend to the gentleman the report prepared by a committee of the minority party, the chairman of which was our colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], in which he defined the territory that he felt we should be prepared to defend, and I may say that the island of Guam was well beyond the line of defense that he outlined in his report. To answer further the question which the gentleman has raised about providing for the Army and the Navy, I think the committee should be commended for the statement to be found on page 15 of

the report, in which they point out that they have gone beyond the Budget estimates at least \$200,000 in providing for our Naval Reserve. They recommend the building of experimental laboratories, and I think in that connection we could all give thought to increasing, not only numerically, but also the efficiency of our Reserve and the National Guard. It has been the policy of this country ever since the beginning to depend on the Organized Reserve, the old militia, the old State guard, and I hope that we can build up these Reserve forces and our National Guard before we go on and expand and develop a huge standing Army.

Mr. GEYER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER. Yes.

Mr. GEYER of California. In view of the fact that the Budget makes quite a cut in the C. C. C. and in the N. Y. A. and the W. P. A. and increases the amount for defense, does it not seem to the gentleman that this is almost carrying out the slogan, "Guns instead of bread"?

Mr. MILLER. Of course I have not seen and do not think the gentleman has seen the appropriation bill making provisions for the C. C. C. or the W. P. A., but I have no desire to see the W. P. A. cut and will vote for the items recommended by the Budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Connecticut has expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 minute more.

Mr. MILLER. To further answer the gentleman, I think the Members of the House would be much more enthusiastic in voting for increased appropriations for the C. C. C. if we could arrange to give them at least a minimum of military training while they are in the C. C. C. service.

Mr. GEYER of California. Of course, with that part I would not agree, but I do agree with everything else the gentleman has said about that.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I now yield to the gentleman from California [Mr. WELCH].

PURCHASE OF HUNTERS POINT, SAN FRANCISCO

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to a provision in the naval public works authorization bill during the last session of Congress and now Public Law 106, the bill under consideration provides for an expenditure of \$6,000,000 to purchase Hunters Point—\$4,000,000 for the property and appurtenances and \$2,000,000 for new improvements thereon.

The strategic importance of San Francisco Bay and Hunters Point has been stressed by the Navy Department on many occasions. Special commissions appointed by Congress have also stressed, from a national-defense standpoint, the importance of San Francisco Bay and Hunters Point.

Admiral J. W. Helm, who was senior member of a special commission appointed by Congress to select a site for a contemplated naval base on the southerly end of San Francisco Bay, made a report from which I quote, in part:

San Francisco Bay is the only body of water on the Pacific coast south of Cape Flattery offering a safe anchorage from wind and weather to a large number of ships, which can be entered under all ordinary conditions of wind and sea.

San Francisco Bay has ample anchorage with a good holding ground for a fleet of any size.

Admiral Charles F. Hughes, when Chief of Naval Operations, made the following statement:

San Francisco Bay is, as you know, the principal harbor of the Pacific coast. To my mind, it belongs to the Nation; it is not the property of California nor of the cities that are on its shores. From its natural advantages and its location, San Francisco Bay is certain to be the major continental fleet base for any extensive campaign in the Pacific. It will be the point where the fleet will concentrate at the beginning of a war.

Admiral William D. Leahy, former Chief of Naval Operations, during the hearing on the naval authorization bill, also made the following statement:

The program does not provide for a naval drydock in the San Francisco Bay area capable of taking a major capital ship. The privately owned drydocks at Hunters Point, lacking in the equipment necessary for repairs to our large war vessels, are not a satisfactory solution to the Navy's problem in time of war.

In my opinion, the Navy should acquire the Hunters Point drydocks and should provide weight-handling facilities, power connections, galley, latrines, storehouse, and an assembly plant to permit the overhaul of our largest vessels in conjunction with the Mare Island Navy Yard.

During this hearing Rear Admiral Moreell, Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, supporting Admiral Leahy, also made a strong statement urging the purchase of Hunters Point.

At the last session of Congress a board was appointed by the Secretary of the Navy to investigate and report upon the need, for the purpose of national defense, of the acquisition of Hunters Point drydock. I quote from that report:

24. Studies of shipbuilding and drydock facilities, both naval and commercial, show that on the Pacific coast there are, at the present time, only one existing naval drydock and another under construction which will accommodate battleships and aircraft carriers. (Dock No. 3 at Hunters Point, which is a commercial dock, is not taken into consideration for reasons which will be made apparent in the next paragraph.) Both of these docks are located at the Puget Sound Navy Yard, Bremerton, Wash. In other words, in a coast line some 1,260 miles long, naval facilities for docking our capital ships exist at only one point; namely, the northern terminus of our coast line. Except during the summer months, operations of the fleet are carried on at least 1,000 or more miles to the southward of this point. This means, in effect, that for the greater part of the year any of our major ships requiring regular or emergency docking in naval docks must steam on the order of 2,000 or more miles. With excellent facilities available in the San Francisco Bay area such a procedure is economically unsound. Furthermore, it is illogical to presuppose that, in the event of a national emergency, concentration of all of our major ships would take place at only one point, and that point the most northern one, of our Pacific frontier. Thus, both from economic and strategic viewpoints, the establishment of a naval drydock capable of taking care of our capital ships in the San Francisco Bay area is fully warranted.

25. In the preceding paragraph no consideration has been given to utilization of the commercial drydocks at Hunters Point to care for at least a part of the docking needs of our major naval vessels. The reasons for not considering this, and all other commercial docks, are as follows:

(1) Security: Many of the intricate mechanisms which require repair and overhaul while a naval vessel is in drydock are of a secret or confidential nature and should not be open to general inspection by other than regular naval civil employees. This condition can very well be handled at a navy yard or station where all civilian employees have been inducted into the service under strict civil-service procedures and all activities are under rigid control. At a commercial plant such control would be an exceedingly difficult if not an impossible matter.

(2) Lack of specially trained workmen: The workmen employed at a commercial yard are normally fully familiar with routine overhaul work. However, the intricate and highly technical military equipment on a man-of-war requires specially trained personnel.

(3) Lack of adequate facilities: The power-length ratios of naval vessels are many times greater than those of commercial vessels and, as a consequence, the normal commercial yard does not have the shop capacity nor the weight-handling equipment which are essential for proper overhaul of naval vessels. As was pointed out in paragraph 4, the Hunters Point dock is lacking in even the minimum essential facilities for minor overhaul and the present owners have failed to provide these facilities on the ground that the income from their plant does not warrant the necessary expenditure.

(4) Lack of availability: Even though the use of a commercial dock is contracted for by the Government, there is no assurance that it will be fully available for naval vessels if necessity demands. Experience has indicated that in many instances commercial docking facilities have not been maintained in a condition suitable for instant use by naval vessels.

26. The Board has also given consideration to the practicability of equipping the Hunters Point drydocks with necessary facilities for work on naval vessels, the docks to remain in private ownership and to be operated as commercial facilities. The Board considers such an arrangement to be undesirable and impracticable if the Hunters Point docks are to be utilized for overhauls, as well as for interim dockings. In the foregoing paragraph reference is made to the need for security and the lack of specially trained workmen at commercial plants. In addition, if the fullest use is to be made of the Hunters Point docks, they should be operated as an annex to the Mare Island Navy Yard in order that the splendid shop facilities of that yard may be fully available. The coordination of the navy yard's work with activities of a commercial plant of the kind under consideration would be a difficult, time-consuming, and costly procedure. Furthermore, a very important consideration is the fact that under present conditions it has been impracticable to keep naval vessels in commercial docks for periods sufficient to permit proper drying out and painting because of the large docking charges. The Board of Inspection and Survey has repeatedly called attention to the insufficiency of the times spent in drydock and the resulting deterioration. If the docks are Government-owned, the vessels will undoubtedly be left in dock for longer periods with little additional cost.

27. The selection of a site for the construction of a naval drydock in the San Francisco Bay area will be governed, among others, by the following considerations:

(a) The size of the ship for which the facility is needed, particularly the draft.

(b) The dock's proximity to the present fully equipped Naval Establishment at Mare Island.

(c) Real-estate values at or near the site under discussion.

(d) Foundation conditions, particularly as regards their effect upon the cost of construction of a graving dock.

(e) As a corollary to (a), the depth and the width of the channel leading to the specific site.

28. In the entire San Francisco Bay area only three locations will satisfy the foregoing considerations to the extent that serious consideration should be given them for drydock construction, namely, Mare Island, Oakland-Alameda, and South San Francisco-Hunters Point.

29. The channel leading to Mare Island has a controlling depth of 30 feet and to increase and maintain an increased depth would prove inordinately expensive.

30. As regards a choice between the two remaining sites both have, or can be made to have, sufficient depth of water to permit access to them by battleships. The Hunters Point site, however, is more favorably situated in this respect since deep water is had immediately off-shore. Both sites are approximately the same distance from Mare Island. Real-estate values run about the same at both places. The main point of difference between the two sites lies in the drydock foundation conditions. These conditions are all in favor of the Hunters Point site and have made for much smaller drydock construction costs at that location. This one fact makes the element of total cost, including the purchase of existing facilities and the provision of such others as are necessary, for the establishment of naval docks in favor of Hunters Point and indicates its selection.

31. Information obtained by the Board from the Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation indicates that during the period from January 1, 1937, to January 1, 1939, 76 commercial ships used these facilities, occupying them for an average of 176 dock-days per year. Of all the vessels utilizing the docks only six are of such dimensions that they cannot utilize other docking facilities in the San Francisco Bay area for their necessary overhaul. These six ships actually used the Hunters Point docks during the period mentioned above for an average of 20 days per year. Were these docks Navy-owned, provision could be made to permit their use for the routine docking and overhaul of the six commercial ships mentioned above.

The Bethlehem Shipbuilding Corporation, owners of Hunters Point drydocks, and the Navy Department have agreed on a purchase price of \$3,993,572—the company to have use of the docks for a period of 3 years. In the meantime, if the money is made available, the Navy will proceed immediately with the very necessary improvements.

It should be borne in mind that at the present time the only drydocks on the Pacific coast large enough to accommodate major naval ships with adequate repair facilities are at Bremerton, Wash., 815 miles north of San Francisco Bay.

I do not claim to be an authority on naval defense, but as a Representative from the Pacific coast and a member of the Committee on Merchant Marine during the 15 years I have been in Congress, I have given serious consideration to national defense. Our Navy, which is the first line of national defense, consists of three links all of which are interdependent upon each other—the Navy, the merchant marine, and facilities for building, repairing, and docking ships.

For the first time since the World War, shipbuilding has been resumed on the Pacific coast, but facilities for docking and overhauling capital ships, referred to by Admiral Leahy, do not exist, with the exception of the one facility on Puget Sound.

This great land-locked harbor—San Francisco Bay—should be equipped with every modern facility necessary for national defense.

There should be no further delay in giving to the Navy the security which San Francisco Bay and Hunters Point afford as maintained by the naval authorities which I have quoted.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS].

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Chairman, I think the pending appropriation bill, generally speaking, is a very good one and I think the committee is to be commended. They have done a splendid job. I have no quarrel with them. I think they have been as liberal as it is possible to be under the circumstances, which means that they have granted everything that can be constructed properly during the period for which they have appropriated. At the same time I think they have made no unreasonable cuts. I shall address myself now particularly

to the question of Guam, about which there seems to be so much misunderstanding. In the first place the assumption is that this is launching into a new adventure in the Far East. Nothing could be further from the truth. Let us examine the facts. Guam has been in the possession of the United States for some 40 years. Guam has been occupied by the United States during that period. We have maintained a naval base there during practically all that entire period. We are using it today and we have been using it. We had an active squadron in Guam until about 1932. There was never any protest by Japan or by anybody else. I cannot see what difference it would make whether Japan protests or not. I do not believe there can be any very great sincerity behind a protest by Japan against our using or defending our own territory. Nobody has questioned our right to Guam or our occupancy of Guam. On the other hand Japan occupies a great many surrounding islands to which there is a great question as to the right of Japan to be there at all. They are the mandated islands, and under the mandate and by treaty Japan agreed not to fortify those islands, and we are all certain as a matter of fact that they are fortified. I do not think Japan is going to get very mad at us and go to war because we take out some coral heads in the island of Guam. What we are asking to do is not making the slightest change in our policy over what we have been doing for 40 years, which is to use the island of Guam both for the Navy and commercially. The Pan American Airways, which is an important commercial link with the Orient, uses Guam. It is one of their regular stations. That company has built an overnight hotel there. The increased size of the planes has made it dangerous to operate in Guam because of these coral heads. It is true that last year there was a proposal to spend \$5,000,000 to dredge the harbor so as to be able to bring up seaplane tenders and build certain docks, and do shore construction in connection therewith. That is not involved in the present appropriation bill at all.

It is merely to remove the coral heads and make it possible to have proper sea runways for the planes which are using Guam and will continue to use it anyway. It is merely a question of whether you improve that harbor the same as you do any other harbor in the country when the size of ships increases and the traffic makes it necessary to improve the harbor.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. With pleasure.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. I would like to know, if that last statement is correct, why the Rivers and Harbors Committee does not bring in a bill to authorize an appropriation for the Island of Guam, and have the Appropriations Committee present it?

Mr. MAAS. Because that is not the proper legislative situation. This island is under the jurisdiction of the Navy and always has been. The Navy has authorization under proper law to do harbor dredging in the fourteenth naval district. The question of authorization is not involved in this at all. Nobody questions their authority to do this. It is merely a question of the appropriation with which to do it. The Rivers and Harbors Committee has nothing whatever to do with it. It is being presented in a perfectly legal and proper manner.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. Yes; I am glad to yield to my chairman.

Mr. VINSON of Georgia. Does the gentleman think that we need worry about Japan's protest? History shows that Japan likewise protested against the fortification of the Hawaiian Islands.

Mr. MAAS. Yes. They even protested against the individual who was sent to command the naval forces at Hawaii. I do not think we need worry about Japanese protests any more than they worry about our protests. They sunk the *Panay* and we protested, but they did not get very excited about it. They knew we were not going to war about it, and we know they are not going to war because we improve the island of Guam. All this talk about it being too far away and

that we are dispersing our defenses and launching into a new policy is not in conformity with the facts. If it were possible for us to draw a line from the Aleutian Islands through Hawaii to Panama and say, "That is our sphere and we will never go beyond it, we are going to defend just that line," that would be fine, if we could do it. That is our defense line. We do not ever propose to permit any foreign hostile navy to cross that line, but we must have scouts out beyond that line in advance to know whether or not they are coming to that line before we can stop them at the line. Once they get to the line it will be too late to stop them.

Mr. THOMASON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. THOMASON. Does not the gentleman think that it is inconsistent to say that we are going to get out of the Philippines not later than 1946, and I heard some eminent gentleman say on the radio the other night in 1942—does not the gentleman think it is inconsistent to say that just as we are planning to get out of the Philippines, then we should begin to improve the island of Guam, which, of course, is the camel getting its nose under the tent, because later it means fortification and involvement in the Far East?

Mr. MAAS. No; I do not agree with the gentleman at all. I think the very fact that the gentleman states—that is, that we are going to get out of the Philippines—makes it imperative to improve the island of Guam.

Mr. THOMASON. Does not the gentleman think that we had better concentrate our national-defense activities here in our own country and our nearby possessions rather than going away out into the Pacific?

Mr. MAAS. Oh, the gentleman misunderstands the purpose of developing the harbor at Guam. We are not dispersing our defense forces at all; but in pursuing the subject about getting out of the Philippines, I have always in the past been opposed to giving up the Philippines. I was frank to say it was because I thought they would be of value to us and we could make some money out of them. We have done more for the Filipino people than any other nation has done for them in the history of the world. We promised them their independence. They are not going to get it. They are going to get something infinitely worse, in my opinion, than anything they have ever had in the past when they are cut loose. But they have been continually asking to be cut loose and I am now in favor of cutting them loose. But when we do cut them loose, it becomes doubly important that we develop Guam for ourselves, because the gentleman must realize that we are not a self-sufficient Nation. We are not even a self-sufficient hemisphere, unfortunately. The United States has to go to the Far East to get certain essential strategic raw materials, such as tin, rubber, tungsten, and chromium. Without those essential raw materials, peacetime industry in this country would collapse.

Mr. THOMASON. Well, granting all of that, the gentleman does not contend that we would have to send an army and navy over there to get it?

Mr. MAAS. Oh, you might have to. At least, be able to, potentially. The whole theory of your commerce is that we be able to protect our trade routes.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. CALDWELL. Aside from the improvement as contemplated by this bill, which is in no sense military, it is absolutely essential to our peacetime activity, and I am wondering whether the gentleman agrees with me that if the United States asserted some degree of independence, if it asserted its own right to do as it pleases with its own property, that in itself would not be a step toward peace rather than toward war?

Mr. MAAS. I am satisfied the gentleman is absolutely right. I do not believe there is anything that would create more respect on the part of the Japanese for America than for us to say, "We are going to do as we see fit with our own territory."

Mr. THOMASON. Then if the gentleman is right, why not stay in the Philippines?

Mr. MAAS. As far as the Japanese are concerned, I would.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. SUTPHIN. I would like to ask my colleague from Florida a question. Perhaps he can tell us what our commerce amounted to last year.

Mr. CALDWELL. I said peacetime pursuits.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Well, that is commerce, is it not?

Mr. CALDWELL. I say that because Guam is midway between the Philippine Islands and Midway Island and is a necessary landing place for civilian airplanes.

Mr. SUTPHIN. I am told that the imports from Guam last year amounted to less than \$75,000.

Mr. MAAS. I do not think the gentleman from Florida was even discussing the question of our trade with Guam. What he was stressing is the fact that Guam is an essential stopping point. Just as long as this Nation hopes to trade in the Orient at all, we must have trade routes. Aviation is becoming increasingly important in international trade. To continue it in the Orient, we have to have a stop at Guam.

Mr. CALDWELL. Or, to put it another way, I do not believe that America can ever have peace by tucking its tail between its legs and running every time anyone says that a particular line of activity offends him.

Mr. MAAS. Of course not; and anybody who has studied the Orient at all, or the oriental mind, knows that they interpret kindness for cowardice and conciliation as weakness. I do not mean that we have to be ruthless, but certainly we have got to be ruthless in defending our own rights or we shall have the respect of no one, least of all the orientals.

From the standpoint of the Pan American Airways operations, they are making a very valuable contribution to our commercial life. They would have to suspend operations if there were not some place in the approximate location of Guam where they could make a stop, for in their present state of development our planes today have not sufficient range to make the jump from Hawaii to the Philippines. Until 1946, at least, the Philippines are ours, and until that time we will maintain naval forces in the Philippines. We have a squadron of patrol planes in the Philippines now. These planes have to come back to Hawaii for overhaul. They have to have a stop approximately where Guam is to make the trip to and from the Philippines. We are going to continue this policy for the next 6 years at least, and we are going to have this squadron and maybe more squadrons over there. Incidentally, Japan has not gone to war with us for keeping a squadron of patrol planes in the Philippines, which is just as close to Japan as Guam is; and I do not believe Japan is going to go to war with us over Guam, no matter what we do in Guam. Japan fears that we are going to try to interfere with her plans in China. I do not believe we are going to interfere with her plans in China. I do not believe that our trade in China would justify our participating in an oriental war at all, and we will not have to if we make clear to Japan that we are going to defend ourselves and our own interests and our right to essential raw materials, but will let her alone in her own sphere. Under such a policy I do not think we would have any trouble with Japan at all. But should we have trouble, Guam, in my opinion, is the only alternative to a two-ocean navy.

The ideal defense of this country would be two fleets, because we are a two-ocean nation. I do not believe we are going to have two fleets, although personally I am an advocate of it. I do not, however, believe that our national economy is such that we can afford it—at least we cannot afford two navies at the present time. If ever we are threatened, it is going to be in both oceans at the same time. No one single nation is going to be foolhardy enough to attack the United States or its essential interests alone, but a possible coalition of European and oriental powers would be a very serious threat to us because we have only one fleet. Regardless, however, of where our fleet might be, in my opinion, if we were threatened in both oceans at the same time, that fleet would

be put in the Atlantic. Since we have only one fleet, and it would not be feasible to split the fleet, it is going to go into the Atlantic, because 75 percent of the population and of the industrial structure of this Nation is in the Northeast. Draw a line from Chicago to Norfolk. Everything northeast of that has got to be defended first. We would simply have to risk the consequences in the Pacific if we were threatened in both oceans at the same time in order to protect the northeast sector first.

But, Mr. Chairman, if we develop the harbor at Guam—of course, if it were fortified it would be a thousand times better; we can maintain patrol squadrons there—let me point out just what this will mean to us. It might even mean the difference between victory and defeat; certainly it could mean the difference between a long and disastrous war and a short, victorious war.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. When Admiral Leahy was before the committee and we were talking about Guam, as I recall, I asked him this question: "Suppose Guam were fortified. In case of an invasion by the Japanese, how long could Guam hold out, having spent \$90,000,000 or \$100,000,000?" as were the figures at that time proposed.

He said, "Congressman, I think Guam could hold out possibly 3 weeks."

How much defense would that be?

Mr. MAAS. I think the gentleman is mistaken. I think he said from 3 weeks to 3 months.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. I am certain that he said 3 weeks. The gentleman will find it in the record.

Mr. MAAS. Possibly the admiral is mistaken, or was misunderstood. That could happen.

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. He may have been.

Mr. MAAS. I may say to the gentleman that I have been in Guam and I have made a military study of it. If it were fortified, we would be absolutely invincible, and, in my opinion, we would be immune from attack in either ocean. I say that because if we were threatened in the Atlantic our fleet could proceed to the Atlantic, meet the threat in the Atlantic, engage the enemy fleet until it had destroyed the coalition fleet in that theater of operation. In the meantime, the Japanese would never proceed beyond Guam until it had first reduced it. No fleet commander would ever dream of leaving a fortified base between his home port and the operating fleet. To do so would be suicide, both for his home country and for his fleet. If the Japanese, in fact, proceeded to Panama, to Hawaii, or the Aleutian Islands and left Guam still fortified and as an operating base, our forces could immediately proceed from Guam to cut off communications and supplies between the Japanese fleet and Japan. We could then proceed to destroy their fleet at will, in the meantime wreaking terrific destruction in Tokio and on all of Japan. So no naval commander would move his fleet beyond Guam, if it were fortified, and if it were fortified it would take a major naval operation to reduce it. It would take at a minimum 3 months to reduce Guam if it were fortified. In that time our fleet could dispose of the enemy in the Atlantic, return to the Pacific, and then meet the Japanese fleet under the most favorable conditions to our own fleet.

Mr. MASSINGALE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I would like to ask a question for my own information. I am entirely ignorant of military maneuvers. I want to view this thing right. I may say that I voted against fortifying Guam the last time this matter was up and if I did wrong I want to correct the wrong. The gentleman has said that the necessity for fortifying Guam is that an admiral of the Japanese Navy, having a desire to attack the west coast of the United States, would not dare do so and leave behind him, after he moved eastward, a fort or a fortification of some sort. Why would they do that anyway with the intervening fortifications that we have in the Hawaiian Islands?

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman must realize that there is a vast difference in your points of radius from Guam and Hawaii. Guam is close enough to Japan so that planes based there can immediately observe the movement of the Japanese fleet. It cannot get beyond Guam without being detected from Guam. On the other hand, it could go to the Aleutian Islands or Panama and avoid Hawaii entirely. More important than that is this: Even if we fortify Guam, or do just what we are going to do by this bill, we will continue to use it, anyway. If we do not do what is provided in this bill, we will have to spend more money than the cost of this dredging in replacing planes that will get cracked up over there in Guam. We are going to use Guam all the time. We are going to use it every day, and we will continue to use it. If we do nothing else but make the harbor at Guam adequate for patrol planes that in itself would be of infinite value to this Nation in case we are threatened. Let me explain to the gentleman why that is. I am talking now about an unfortified Guam. We are operating patrol planes through there now, and we undoubtedly will operate patrols in Guam if the situation necessitates. Patrol planes radiating out of Guam can keep the Japanese Navy under surveillance all the time. The Japanese Navy could not move in any direction without the high command of our Navy knowing it through our scout planes operating out of Guam. We could not get that information out of Hawaii until they had already gotten too far, perhaps, for our Navy to intercept them. But Guam is close enough to Japan so that the first movement of the Japanese Navy will be detected by our pilots and radioed to our fleet commanders, so that if they start in any direction toward a vulnerable spot in our defense system our fleet will know it and the distance necessary to intercept them will be shorter for our Navy than it is for their Navy to get to a vulnerable point.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 5 additional minutes.

Mr. MASSINGALE. I would like to ask one more question. As I understand the gentleman, this appropriation is intended only for the purpose of making Guam a place at which airships may land and take off?

Mr. MAAS. That is correct.

Mr. MASSINGALE. It does not contemplate any kind of a haven or harbor for any sea ships?

Mr. MAAS. No; it does not. The bill last year provided that, but the present bill does not so provide.

Mr. THOMASON. Does not the gentleman think that is what it will lead to though? Is that not what the gentleman favors?

Mr. MAAS. Oh, I personally favor that; yes.

Mr. THOMASON. Does the gentleman not think when this appropriation is made it will not be long until somebody will be asking Congress to fortify Guam?

Mr. MAAS. The Congress has control of it. If the occasion arises when that should be done, and it is recommended, the gentleman would be the first one to vote for it, if it is found to be necessary.

Mr. THOMASON. Well, it is inconsistent to be getting out of the Philippines in the next 5 years and at the same time doing something that will lead to the fortification of Guam. I say that is inconsistent.

Mr. MAAS. We will not fortify Guam unless it becomes essential, and if it is essential to our national interest to fortify Guam, we will do so.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say there are flying activities at Guam every day at the present time?

Mr. MAAS. Not in a strict sense every day. I meant it is in use and available every day.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Who is using it?

Mr. MAAS. Pan American and our own Navy.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Our own Navy? To what extent?

Mr. MAAS. Whenever it is necessary to fly back and forth from the Philippines.

Mr. SUTPHIN. The gentleman knows that when the P-13 squadron went out there the fleet was on the west coast. That was last September, and that was their last activity out of Guam. This is February.

Mr. MAAS. But they have to come back for overhaul from time to time, and for training.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Those 12 planes were through there in September.

Mr. MAAS. Yes. Pan American is using it constantly. The gentleman knows it.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Yes; every day.

Mr. MAAS. The gentleman also knows that we maintained an active squadron of the Marine Corps there for many years without any protest from Japan.

Mr. SUTPHIN. We do not maintain it there at the present time.

Mr. MAAS. No; it does not happen to be there at the present time, partly because of the difficulty of operating out of there with those coral reefs.

Mr. SUTPHIN. That marine squadron had land planes.

Mr. MAAS. No; they had both. I was over there when they were there.

Mr. SUTPHIN. How many planes did they have?

Mr. MAAS. They had half a dozen amphibians. They had land planes and amphibians.

Mr. SUTPHIN. Was it 50-50, then?

Mr. MAAS. I do not know how many they had; 12 or 14 land planes and half a dozen amphibians.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAAS. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. The gentleman spoke of using this island as a scouting base. Would this be practical without being able to back it up? In other words, unless the island were fortified there would be no occasion for scouting.

Mr. MAAS. No; I believe the gentleman is mistaken about that. It would be of tremendous value, even if it were not fortified, for scouting. Let me say to the gentleman that if we were operating with our scout planes, the minute we saw the Japanese Navy moving in our direction that information would be reported back to the fleet commander, and the scouting squadrons located at Guam would immediately drop back to Hawaii; but it would have served its purpose of warning our fleet.

Mr. COLMER. The point I am making is that unless the island were fortified those planes would be useless. Japan would not let them operate out of there, assuming that we were engaged in hostilities with Japan.

Mr. MAAS. If we were engaged in hostilities we would not operate out of there if Guam were not fortified. The thing is that it would be the first warning of any move toward hostilities.

Mr. COLMER. What would we want to be scouting the Japanese fleet for if we were not engaged in hostilities?

Mr. MAAS. We want to know before they start hostilities. Japan does not declare a war, it just starts making war, and we want to know as far in advance as possible of any threatened danger.

Mr. COLMER. Do I correctly understand the gentleman to mean that if the Japanese fleet were to move in the direction of Guam on a practice cruise we would want to be notified of it?

Mr. MAAS. If a critical situation existed, as it may be getting to be now, you bet your life we would want to know it. We do not want the first knowledge of it to be some shells falling on Los Angeles, for instance, or the destruction of the Panama Canal.

Mr. COLMER. Does the gentleman contend it would be worth anything from a military standpoint to this country to have this improvement of Guam made unless we followed it up with the expenditure of the \$800,000,000, or whatever it is, to fortify the island?

Mr. MAAS. It is not any \$800,000,000, in the first place; it is \$80,000,000. Or if you wanted to make a complete Gibraltar

out of it the cost would be \$250,000,000; but it would be the cheapest \$250,000,000 this Government ever spent. It is essential that the United States retain and develop Guam to protect our trade routes to the Dutch East Indies and the Malay States, where we get the bulk of our absolutely indispensable raw materials of tin and rubber as well as other strategic materials. So I am in favor of developing the harbor of Guam, whether we fortify the island or not. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

CHAIRMAN MADDEN, OF THE LABOR BOARD, GUILTY OF "UNFAIR PRACTICES," SHOULD BE GIVEN A DOSE OF HIS OWN MEDICINE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Madden, has been guilty of "unfair practices," if not a violation of the Federal statutes. A dose of the medicine which he has been handing out to so many employers throughout the country would not be a bad thing for him.

He has been finding that employers who told their employees, some of whom had worked in the factory for 20 or 25 years, that they need not pay dues or join an organization in order to hold their jobs, were guilty of unfair labor practices. No court as yet has upheld that theory. A circuit court of appeals on the Pacific coast has said that, if the law were construed that way, it would be a denial of free speech. Nevertheless, the Board, since that decision was rendered, has continued to make that same finding against free speech.

Then, too, as we all know, the Supreme Court held as long ago as April of 1937, that an employer need not enter into a written contract or into any contract at all with employees. We can go back further than that. We can recall that, when the law was passed, the Senate committee, in its report bringing the bill to the floor, said the law did not require the making of an agreement. We recall that Senator WAGNER himself, in a letter to the New York Sun in November of 1935, said the law did not require the making of a contract or the signing of a contract.

Nevertheless, Mr. Madden has held that the employer must sign a contract, which is contrary to the decision of the Supreme Court and to the decision of more than one circuit court of appeals.

The Chairman of the National Labor Relations Board, Mr. Madden, has been proceeding on the theory that it is a part of his duty, a part of the duty which he owes to the United States and for the performance of which he receives money appropriated by Congress, to enact or to prevent the enactment of legislation.

Chairman Madden completely forgets that he is not charged with the enactment of legislation. He forgets that it is the duty of Congress to legislate, that it is the duty of the courts to interpret that legislation, and that it is the duty of those boards and agencies of the Federal Government, which are created by the Congress or by Executive order to administer those laws, not to enact them or to change them.

He forgets that there is a Federal statute on the books which makes it a criminal offense for anyone to use, directly or indirectly, funds appropriated by Congress to pay for personal services or incur expense to influence Members of Congress to favor or oppose legislation.

Mr. Madden, acting as Chairman of the Labor Board, has been very quick to condemn employers, to find them guilty of a violation of the National Labor Relations Act. He has set himself up on a throne, from which he has criticized not only the acts but the motives of those employers who still believe that this is a free Government; that the right of free speech and a free press guaranteed by the Federal Constitution has not been abrogated.

He has condemned, both by his decisions and by his public utterances, those who have ventured to disagree with his construction of the National Labor Relations Act. He has made some very arbitrary and unjust decisions. He has gone so far as to create a situation where employees, who are guaranteed the right of collective bargaining by section 7 of the act, are by his decisions actually deprived of that right.

As long as Chairman Madden presumes to sit in judgment not only over the acts of employers but on their motives, it is well that we call his attention to some of his own shortcomings. It is well that he be asked publicly whether it is not true that he has violated section 201 of title 18 of the Criminal Code of the United States. It is well that we ask him whether his own testimony before the Smith committee does not convict him of such a violation.

Having received his answer, it is well that we throw back into his teeth the statement that he has deliberately, willfully, and for the purpose of maintaining and extending his authority, employed his time, paid for by money appropriated by Congress to prevent amendment to the N. L. R. A. and that his conduct, many think, is in violation of section 201.

Here are the facts, and there is no dispute, for the testimony comes from the mouth of Chairman Madden.

Let me quote the statute; but before doing that, let me give you an illustration of how much truth there is in the testimony of Mr. Madden—and I want to give it to you from his own testimony and not from what somebody else has said.

He said this—I am reading from page 678 of the hearings before the Smith committee under date of February 8, 1940:

The charge on page 22 of Senator BURKE's statement that the Board appointed a trial examiner "who had written and published a book on the C. I. O. lauding that organization in the most glowing terms" is erroneous.

Now, get this; the other was preliminary:

The facts are that the Board designated Prof. J. Raymond Walsh, or the Harvard faculty, on a temporary per diem basis, to hear the Heinz case—

And then he goes on and says that after he had learned that Walsh's appointment had been criticized; that after the hearing in which Walsh was then engaged had ended, Walsh was told that his services would not be needed longer.

He testified in substance before the Senate committee that Walsh was only a temporary employee. Let us get the record. The record from the personnel files of the Board, referring to Prof. J. Raymond Walsh, reads—pages 678 and 679 of the Smith committee hearings, under date of February 8, 1940:

Born in the State of Wisconsin, resident of the State of Massachusetts at the time of appointment. He was assigned as a trial examiner to the Empire Furniture Co. case, the Weirton Steel Co. case, the West Virginia Pulp & Paper Co. case, and the H. T. Heinz case.

Madden either did not know or he did not care what his own files showed when he gave that testimony. I submit that when you come to weigh testimony of these Labor Board employees you ought to have a little of their background and know something about previous statements, which they have made before you swallow everything they have said.

Here is section 201 of title XVIII, Criminal Code of the United States:

Use of appropriations to pay for personal service to influence Members of Congress to favor or oppose legislation: No part of the money appropriated by any act shall, in the absence of express authorization by Congress, be used directly or indirectly to pay for any personal service, advertisement, telegram, telephone, letter, printed or written matter, or other device intended or designed to influence in any manner a Member of Congress to favor or oppose, by vote or otherwise, any legislation or appropriation by Congress, whether before or after the introduction of any bill or resolution proposing such legislation or appropriation; but this shall not prevent officers and employees of the United States from communicating to Members of Congress, on the request of any Member of Congress, through the proper official channels, requests for legislation or appropriations which they deem necessary for the efficient conduct of the public business.

Then it provides:

Any officer or employee of the United States who, after notice and hearing by the superior officer vested with the power of removing him, is found to have violated or attempted to violate this section, shall be removed by such superior officer from office or employment. Any officer or employee of the United States who violates or attempts to violate this section shall also be guilty of a misdemeanor and on conviction thereof shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$500 or by imprisonment for not more than 1 year, or both.

Congress wrote the National Labor Relations Act; it created a Board and the President appointed Mr. Madden as Chairman of that Board. Mr. Madden is charged with the duty of

administering the law. Mr. Madden, as Chairman of the Board, has not one single thing to do with the enactment of the law of the amendment or the law or with any attempt to repeal the law. Mr. Madden is not content to be investigator, prosecutor, judge, jury, and executioner under the National Labor Relations Act.

Mr. GROSS. I was just going to add that word—executioner is right.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what he is, and in addition to that he wants to add to his functions as Chairman of the Board the right to tell the Members of Congress that we should not amend the law, and he does that in violation of that statute, does he not? Judge for yourselves whether he does or does not. I am not trying to say or to give a statement of what Mr. Madden does or of what he did with reference to that statute. I shall read to you what he did, his own statement of what he did. Here it is by question and answer, questions by Mr. Toland and answers by Mr. Madden, on February 8, 1940, before the Smith committee (p. 678 of the hearings):

Q. Now, let me ask you this question, Mr. Madden. Do you have any recollection of trying to incite unions connected with the American Federation of Labor or labor leaders to appear before the Senate Committee on Education and Labor in opposition to amendments to the Wagner Act?—A. Yes; I have some recollection. I would not adopt your term.

Let me pause there for a moment.

Mr. Madden is charged with administering this law impartially and fairly, and he steps out of character, and attempts to incite—oh, he objects to that word—he advises, some of the officials of the unions, like Dubinsky's, and members of the A. F. of L. to go against the A. F. of L. organization leaders, which, of course, they have a right to do. He also advises them to appear before the Congress and oppose amendments to the law. Does he use Federal money? He sends out communications, or his Board sends out communications, and if they are franked and do not need postage, the paper at least costs something. Does he not send them out in violation of that Federal statute—this man who said that the employer may not even say to the boy or girl who works in a factory that they need not pay tribute to work there—this man says that such a statement is an unfair labor practice, and condemns the employers for that, and then if they are guilty of that and men cease work, he orders a reinstatement of these men and the payment to them of back wages. That is what this man Madden does in violation of that statute. He lobbies to induce Congress to refuse to amend the law and he endeavors to incite members of a union to oppose a course advocated by their leaders. What kind of an Administrator is that? Is it not enough that the American Federation of Labor has charged him with bias and prejudice? Must we retain him longer? Must we still keep on the books an act which is unfair and retain a Board, a member of which lobbies in violation of a Federal statute?

Here is some more of his testimony:

Q. Let us strike out the word "incite." Let us say that you sought their assistance.—A. I have a recollection that I invited David Dubinsky to appear before the Senate committee.

What would you think of a judge, or what would you think of a man at the head of a committee, even though it is not a judicial committee, but who is charged with sitting there fair and impartial, holding the scales of justice, sending out to have witnesses come in to testify in behalf of what the judge thought we ought to have? Is it true that this Congress is not competent, is not able to enact legislation? Must we submit to lobbying on the part of the chairman of a board who is presumed to be exercising judicial functions?

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Has the gentleman ever heard tell of a Federal judge appearing before a legislative committee of Congress for the purpose of having certain legislation enacted?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Personally I have not, but I know of no reason—

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. May I inform the gentleman that as a member of the Committee on the Judiciary it was my privilege during the last session of Congress to have some of the ablest Federal judges in the United States appear before that committee and advocate the passage of legislation?

Mr. HOFFMAN. That has no application to this case. Mr. Madden appeared before the Senate and House committees and before the House special committee. That is proper enough. But that is an entirely different thing than using Federal money to induce others to advocate or oppose legislation which he is employed to administer. There is another thing that does not put Mr. Madden in that class, and that is his bias and prejudice and his evident sympathy for and acts in behalf of one organization as against the other; nor does the practice change the law in any respect. I know nothing about what these Federal judges have done, but the fact that some Federal judge did something does not make it proper; and I do recall that not long ago a Federal judge somewhere in these United States had the robes stripped from him, and that is what I am advocating should be done about Mr. Madden.

Mr. MURDOCK of Utah. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I think not. The gentleman can get all of the time he wants here in this debate. To continue with the testimony:

Q. Do you have any recollection as to any other labor leader?

A. I don't; it may have happened, but I have no recollection of any other.

Q. Do you have any recollection of seeing any correspondence that was sent out to regional directors asking them to see what they could do to get American Federation of Labor unions to oppose the American Federation of Labor amendments?

A. Well, I am not sure whether I saw any of that correspondence. I have no doubt that there may have been some.

What business have the employees of the Labor Board lobbying against or for amendments, as long as that statute remains on the books?

Those questions and the answers to those questions disclose that Chairman Madden, forsaking his position as administrator of the law, sought to become a creator of legislation, a preserver of legislation; that he not only sought to do this himself, but that, using time paid for by Federal appropriations, he besought others to lobby toward the same end.

The testimony shows that he attempted to influence members of the American Federation of Labor to revolt against their leadership and to appear before a committee of the Senate in opposition to amendments to the National Labor Relations Act.

Chairman Madden is not an impartial administrator. He is not an impartial judge. He is an advocate. He is an assistant to the C. I. O. He is a lobbyist. He is a lobbyist whose time is paid for by appropriations made by Congress. Is there any reason why he, who is so ready to condemn employers, who many times innocently violate the law, should not be subject to the law? Why not give him an application of his own methods? Why not let him appear before a jury of his peers and answer to the charge that he has violated the criminal statute of the United States?

That Mr. Madden did not act inadvertently when he indulged in this improper conduct, when he became a lobbyist, is further shown by the questions asked him by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. ROUTZOHN], and the answers of Mr. Madden, which will be found beginning on page 699 of the Smith hearings, under date of February 8, 1940:

A. * * * We have regarded ourselves, although our people have jobs out of this enterprise, and are to that extent interested in it, in addition to that, as trustees of this enterprise for the benefit of those who are to be protected by this law.

Q. Is there anything in the law which indicates that you are the trustees of the law itself?

A. I think any public official whose duty it is to enforce a law for the protection of people is a trustee of that law for those people.

Q. And you think that that justified you in doing something that was an inappropriate thing, that is, soliciting something from those who had to deal with you week in and week out throughout the administration of this act?

A. Well, that was our justification for it, Congressman.

Q. What do you think about it at this time, having given it some consideration? Do you think that that was the proper thing to do?

A. I am inclined to think that if we were in a situation where some congressional action were about to be taken on 24 hours' notice so that the people who are the real beneficiaries of this act would not even be aware that there was a problem before Congress by the time that this problem was to be decided, I am inclined to think that we would tell them that that problem was up.

Q. Mr. Madden, didn't you take into consideration, if you were considering it at all—that is, the propriety of what you were doing—that you had a friendly administration, and that that administration had a fairly good sized majority in the Congress, and it, itself, could take care of that for you?

A. Well, the situation was that the Appropriations Committee of this friendly administration had made an adverse report in which they had cut our funds to the point of destruction, and that even after our effort in lobbying it was a rather narrow squeak by which we got the money.

Q. Let's work this down to the last analysis. Did you get the money?

A. Yes.

Q. Did it come through your efforts or did it come through the efforts of the administration? Which had the most influence?

A. Well, that time I think what we did was needed.

Q. At that time you thought it was needed, is that it?

A. Yes.

The point I am trying to make is this, that all through the activities of this Board—and you will find plenty of illustrations if you will run through the hearings of the Smith committee—runs the theory that the members of the Board are charged with the duty of forcing all workers into a labor organization. That is what is back of it all. Not only that, but if you will go a little further in these hearings, you will find in the record of February 8, 1940, where Mr. Witt, secretary of the Board, with the sanction and approval of Mr. Madden, sent out to regional directors throughout the country a letter of instruction, written by Lee Pressman, attorney for the C. I. O., advocating the practice of reducing the complaints as much as possible. That was for the purpose of charging one single act, on which an order of the Board holding that the employer was guilty of unfair labor practice might be based; then get a general, widesweeping order of the Board to cease and desist, and you have a blanket order against the employer. If ever in the future that employer is guilty of an unfair labor practice, prohibited by the general terms of the order, then you could bring that employer before a Federal court, in a contempt proceeding, without a hearing before the Board, for the violation of that order of the Board, which may have been issued on just one narrow, insignificant charge and conviction. And the employer would have no opportunity to get out of the trap in which he had been caught.

In March of 1939, I introduced a bill, which, if passed, would insure to employees the right to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing—a right which the present act does not in practice always give them, but which it was supposed to protect. The Supreme Court has said at least once and the Circuit Courts of Appeals more than once that the act, as administered, sometimes did not permit employees to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing.

So now we have come down to the time when the A. F. of L. admits, in the interest of fair play, that the act should be amended. We have come down to the time when not only the employers, but the public generally admits that the act should be amended.

How much longer are we going to sit here without acting? Are we going to wait for the Smith committee? We do not know when they will report. They are doing a wonderful job, but they cannot disclose any fundamental principles which are being disregarded, of which we are not now aware. Are we going to wait for the House Labor Committee? One member of the Smith committee asked me if the regular House Labor Committee was holding a side show. I was unable to enlighten him. That committee held hearings during the last regular session. They were here during the special session. Is it the policy of this body to let those two committees go on indefinitely and then, when the summer has rolled away and autumn comes along, to turn about and send, late in the session, a bill to the Senate when we know we are not going to get any action?

Speaking, if I could—and I cannot—only as a Republican with political ideas in mind, I would say, "If you of the majority keep that Wagner law just as it is, refuse to make it fair and just, you will give us some of the best political ammunition for the next campaign that we could get anywhere." Speaking as an American, who believes in fair play; speaking as a Representative who has a duty to the people who sent me here, I would say, "Let us get about our business and amend the National Labor Relations Act so as to make it fair." Oh, yes; I see the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK], a true friend of labor; even he recognizes today that the Board's conduct has been rotten; that you have got to have a board with membership of five, as the gentleman said in the beginning, and that you have got to make the law fair and just, and the Board judicial.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. My time has just expired.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 3 additional minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. I just wanted to ask, since we have clothed the Smith committee with the authority and have given it the time and money to make this investigation along the lines discussed by the gentleman, whether we had better get all the facts we can before undertaking the sort of legislation recommended by the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That Smith committee has been doing a wonderful job. They have disclosed a mess that stinks to high heaven, but if we wait for the Smith committee to disclose all of the bias and prejudice and iniquities of the Labor Board, we will wait here until we meet again in some other session. There is no question about that.

Mr. PATRICK. Does not the gentleman feel that if we wait for that Smith committee to make its report, we will make a law then too strong for him to support?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, that is just a silly, foolish question.

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, of course. [Laughter.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CREAL].

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to speak for a brief moment concerning the National Youth Congress.

Long accustomed to the legal philosophy that all persons and all organizations are entitled to the benefit of all doubts, and that regardless of things derogatory or detrimental said of or about them they are presumed to be innocent until proven guilty. When many weeks ago it was said this organization was communistically inclined and other prominent folks said that it was not, I had no opinion, for I had no evidence. But I want to say that the demonstrations which we have had and the evidence which has been disclosed in the past week should no longer leave any doubt in any man's mind that the organization has not only within its ranks Communists, but that the ultimate aim is that these Communists shall control and direct its movements, if you take an organization by what it does as well as what it says.

In the first place, there is not any organization in America of any discretion that would object to a resolution being placed before it to purge it of Communists, unless it had Communists within its ranks. Such mere refusal is equivalent to pleading guilty. Or, take again an organization that is so impolite, whether it be made up of youth or mature folks, as to boo its own invited speakers, as to follow the unparliamentary procedure of forcibly ejecting one of its members from the audience, a member who wanted to introduce a resolution, instead of tabling the resolution in the parliamentary manner, or voting it down, if they saw fit; an organization that would visit the galleries of Congress and hiss Members in the disorderly manner that they did—these three things show that regard for recognized procedure has very little place in their mode of doing things. [Applause.]

Yes; I recognize, as some have said, that they are proceeding under the Bill of Rights. Yes; the Bill of Rights that they flaunt so gallantly. But what bill of rights or its equivalent is in operation in communistic Russia? And if the Communists of America should assume control, then how long

would that blessed Bill of Rights be in use and in practice by the same ones who are now holding it up as one of their constitutional rights? How long would the right of constitutional trial by jury and the presumption of innocence and the regularity of procedure be followed? How long would it be until we would revert to the firing squad of Russia?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I will yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Now that the gentleman has made his criticism of the procedure and various activities of the American Youth Congress, will the gentleman tell us what his idea is with regard to the program that these young people have set before Congress and their appeal that Congress do something with regard to the 4,700,000 young men and women who are out of work and without opportunity of education?

Mr. CREAL. I have voted for the N. Y. A. programs of the past few years, I will say to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CALDWELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. CREAL. That, however, was a different organization and must not be confused, as probably it is confused by a great many, with the National Youth Congress. But as to the program to which the gentleman refers, I would not be influenced to be more for it by reason of being asked by Communists to support it. They do it harm and no good; and I say to the gentleman from New York that as long as Communists are in that organization, they are making one devil of a mess of attempting to advance a program. Communists will do them 10 times more hurt than help.

But if we were to have a program sent to Congress by an organization which has sent the Communists out of it, if the program were asked in the name of Americanism, it would awaken much more sympathetic consideration in the Members of Congress.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Would the gentleman delay any handling of the youth problem until the American Youth Congress has expelled the Communists? Is that the gentleman's viewpoint?

Mr. CREAL. I have no objection to saying that I would not oppose anything that was good for the country that was advocated by somebody, regardless of how much I disliked their general affiliations; I would not oppose anything that was good. But I may say that I would not be induced one particle to favor it because it had a certain amount of Communists within it; and I want to say that when it is known that Communists are in the organization, the overwhelming majority of this House of the Congress would not be inclined to look favorably upon it. These organizations do themselves no good by having Communists help advocate their programs.

Does that answer the gentleman's question as to my position?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CREAL. I think those who are within that organization will continue the effort to purge that organization of the Communists within it, or else withdraw and form an organization composed of people who are not Communists. We look with more or less lethargy and disinterest on this so-called "red" talk, but when you come to invade the youth of America, there is a different issue involved. I am not very much afraid of the bewhiskered, wild-eyed Russian trying to influence the older people, but when you invade the youth and try to entice them into something by statements that you are going to give them jobs and big things, that is the most dangerous thing I have ever heard discussed with reference to the activities of the "reds" during the 5 years I have been a Member of this Congress. When they said 10,000 would come back here next year, most of

those will be Communists; the other people will have gone if they cannot purge the organization.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, it may be true that there is only a small percentage of Communists in there, but does the gentleman believe that nine Americans will ever be able to convert one Communist radical to the American point of view? It is a ravenous, poisonous, dangerous disease that inflicts itself upon certain people who are already partly afflicted mentally and further deranged by the disease when it lights on them. One of these nine might perhaps to some extent influence the others, but the nine will never convert a single Communist to one single idea of American procedure and American ideals.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Does not the gentleman believe that the best guarantee against any "ism" is for this Congress to do something about the youth unemployment problem, particularly in view of the proposed cuts in the present N. Y. A. appropriations, which have proven to be entirely inadequate and have not even begun to touch the problem? Let us discuss and solve the youth unemployment problem, and you will not have to worry about communism or any other "ism."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. CREAL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has asked me several questions. I am going to ask him one. Is he in favor of communism?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. No; I am opposed to communism or any other "ism." I am for capitalism, and I want to preserve American democracy, but you cannot preserve that democracy if you permit 4,700,000 young people to starve in the richest country in the world. You cannot preserve that democracy by evading the problem by means of raising a "red" scare.

Mr. CREAL. And you are not going to promote their interests by defending, commending, and alibing for communism either. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. May I say to the gentleman that the question of communism has been raised solely for the purpose of putting up a smoke screen in order to conceal the real issue. I am telling you how to handle the issue of communism or any other "ism." The only way to handle it is to get jobs for our young people. That is the way you fight any kind of "ism" in this country.

Mr. CREAL. Can the gentleman say that he has any method in particular how to get Communists out of the Government and out of the youth organizations?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Pass the American Youth Act and I repeat you will have no occasion to worry about any "ism" among our young people.

Mr. CREAL. Does the gentleman think that will make good American citizens out of the Communists?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. That will make Americans respect and want to live for America. The best guarantee for Americanism is to give Americans a real stake in the American democracy.

Mr. BOREN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CREAL. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. BOREN. I have listened with great attention to the gentleman's remarks and I think he is eminently correct. I might add as one Member of Congress, and I hope the gentleman will agree with me, if there is anybody in the United States who wants to live under a Communist government there is one in existence in this world and they are welcome to go over there.

Mr. CREAL. No legislative program good, bad, or indifferent will enhance its chance of becoming a law by admitting that part of its ranks are Communists, but such

admission will do much to weaken it. It had better be an organization smaller in number and all with American ideals.

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. PATRICK] 5 minutes.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Chairman, I did not intend to get up and speak on this, but I understand the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] got up the other day in my unfortunate absence and made reference to me. I have a high regard for him. I have been looking for him to smile ever since he came to Congress, but I have yet to see him smile. I had hoped he would be here this afternoon so that we might prod him a little and possibly get him to smile.

In my absence the other day he got up in Congress and said that three of those who had been invited to the White House the other night were not accounted for, mentioning me as one of the three. I do not know what he meant by that. I do not know why we should have to account to the gentleman from Wisconsin. I was invited.

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. DITTER. I wonder if the distinguished gentleman from Alabama would permit me to have the gentleman from Wisconsin here? Does the gentleman feel he would like to have the gentleman from Wisconsin here? He is engaged in committee at the present time, but I could probably get him here.

Mr. PATRICK. Yes, please, get him over here. I would be glad to have him present. I only have 5 minutes, and the gentleman is taking that up.

Mr. DITTER. Shall I take the rest of it up, sir?

Mr. PATRICK. It probably would be better spent. I know the gentleman and I could both agree on that.

Mr. Chairman, I was invited. I got a very polite letter from Mrs. Roosevelt. I assume the others did too. I did not know what it was all about and I did not inquire. I knew it would be all right, or she would not invite us. So I gladly accepted the invitation. She said a few people would be there. There were three of this Youth Congress there, a boy and two girls, or rather a young man and two young ladies, sitting up front beside the First Lady.

I think they had some other things they wished to discuss which were never reached. There were in attendance some, incidentally, that the gentleman from Wisconsin did not happen to get tab on that are absolutely unaccounted for. He did not quite get his personnel right of those who were at the White House. I believe if he had been invited, he would have been there. I hope surely he would have.

The question came up at this White House meeting about this communistic matter. I raised it myself, I think; either I or Senator LEE, of Oklahoma, was the first to raise it. They stated that out of 61 organizations among the young people, 1 was acknowledged as Communist. So Senator LEE and Senator WHEELER, who was there, and I assailed that and stated that as long as there was one communistic organization—

Mr. HOFFMAN. A point of order. Well, I will state it in the form of a request. Is it a violation of the rules to talk about Members of the other body this way?

Mr. PATRICK. No; I think not. We will talk that way. [Laughter.]

So we were there and discussed that matter as to the communistic idea. Those who spoke thought the idea of a little communism in there would ruin their whole program. That matter took up the whole evening. We got there about 9 o'clock and left at nearly 11.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. GROSS. Is it true that the Members who voted against the Dies committee were all there?

Mr. PATRICK. Some were and some were not. I do not know. I voted for the Dies committee.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. I yield to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MILLER. I was just wondering if the gentleman was there as a Member of the House or as a member of the Youth Congress.

Mr. PATRICK. As an invitee of the White House and nothing else. I am a Member of the House, and I could not keep from being a Member of the House, but I did not try to represent either. I do not belong to the Youth Congress.

Mr. MILLER. That is what I was getting at.

Mr. PATRICK. There were no Republicans there, if that is what is paining you in the stomach.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; I yield.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman leave his remarks in the Record just as he makes them?

Mr. PATRICK. Well, I will not consult the gentleman about whether I do or not.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I know; but would the gentleman just leave them in? I should like to see the gentleman leave them in as he makes them.

Mr. PATRICK. I am pretty careful about that. I might this time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I noticed him taking them out. The gentleman is careful.

Mr. PATRICK. Well, once, I will admit; but I will probably leave them in just as they are made this afternoon. But if I see anything in there that I think ought not to be in, if I can, I will get it out. [Laughter.]

After the last day of the youths' conference was over I did have one interesting little conversation. Some of those young folks stayed down at the hotel where I live. This will let a little light in on how they overestimate their importance in this country. However, I do think they have something, if they could get the Communists out, that is worthy of our listening to. This is one little point they brought out that night.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I should like to be generous enough to yield 2 minutes so the gentleman may yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] in due order.

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; I would be glad to do that.

I think sometimes there is no danger of a Congressman overestimating the importance of his job, but there is danger of a Congressman overestimating his own importance. So when I hear a Congressman get up and take the others to task and give an account of their presence, and all that, I think he is taking the wrong attitude; too important. So I have intended not even to answer that, but since it is out we will go into it.

I do think this young group, however, overestimate their own importance; and this is an example: They were standing around there, as I started to say, at the hotel where I live, and I said, "Well, you young people had the President talk to you today." One of them said, "Yes; he talked to us, but," he said, "you know his talk did not go over so hot with us today."

That is what he said about the President of the United States you know. They all seemed to chime in. If there had been just one who said that I would not have thought anything about it but they all seemed to chime in. I do not know whether that was a part of its communistic group or not. They say only one out of the 61 organizations, a comparatively small part of their organization, is communistic.

Of course, I do not believe any true American has any sympathy or can compromise with the communistic program. I do not think they will get anywhere as long as there is a taint of communism in their organization. I do not believe either House of Congress, either the upper or lower branch—whichever you consider upper or lower; I have serious doubts about this House being the lower—will have any hesitation in

refusing to go along with a program for the reason that they are behind it so long as they carry the taint of communism. But we do not want to let that feeling of anticommunism shadow our action and have the effect of disrupting an American program for putting over things that ought to be done, because somebody way across the hollow will be hollering communism. I think there is that danger. I do think there was one thing—regardless of all that, there is one cry that that group is making that is justified, and that is that business, taking up its slack in this Nation, has a tendency to take up the slack with those already employed and those that are older and is leaving a lot of young people out in the cold. I do think there ought to be some constructive legislation enacted that would, if possible, try to reach that threatening trouble.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATRICK. Yes; we took the courtesy to get the gentleman over here so that I might reply to him about anything he had to say.

Mr. KEEFE. I was not privileged to be here while the gentleman was making his remarks.

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, you missed it. [Laughter.]

Mr. KEEFE. Well, I shall have the privilege, perhaps, of reading it in the Record tomorrow.

Mr. PATRICK. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. And I want to say to the gentleman that I am prepared, and will at the proper time, answer not only the gentleman who is on the floor, but the other gentlemen who were kind enough to talk of and concerning me the other day in reference to this youth movement.

Mr. PATRICK. We do not doubt that.

Mr. KEEFE. And I shall be glad to give the gentleman an opportunity when I make that statement to be present. In view of the statement just made—

Mr. PATRICK. Oh, I am sure, the gentleman can do it, brother, believe me.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman not elaborate a little bit, instead of being quite so vague, and tell us just what he proposes in the shape of legislation to give these young people jobs, instead of just talking about it?

Mr. PATRICK. I have no bill; I have no program. So far as I know, I am the only man in Congress without some sort of a bill of this nature.

Mr. KEEFE. Has your party any bill or program?

Mr. PATRICK. Well, my party is a big bunch of folks. About 2 to 1 of the people in America now are Democrats.

Mr. KEEFE. But have you any program?

Mr. PATRICK. So it would be hard for me to announce my program, or anybody's program, for that big group of folks. You know I am just a little pebble on a big beach, and that beach is getting bigger and bigger every day.

Mr. KEEFE. You have suggested this Congress has an obligation to do something to give these people jobs.

Mr. PATRICK. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. We agree on that. Now, have you a suggestion, as one of the great representatives of the people here in Congress—have you a single, concrete suggestion of legislation that will give a single job?

Mr. PATRICK. No; I am simply one of the little ones in the Congress, and I am not saying, "Here is a program." I want to hear you wise boys do something about that, some of you boys with wisdom from up in the Middle West ought to shed some light on that. You have been qualifying to shed light on every other subject that has come up here.

Mr. KEEFE. At least, the gentleman will admit he has no program.

Mr. PATRICK. No program; no. The Democratic Party has a great program, but I am just here, that is all. [Laughter and applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New Hampshire [Mr. JENKS].

Mr. JENKS of New Hampshire. Mr. Chairman, as a comparative novice insofar as national-defense questions are concerned, I hesitate to rise in opposition to an item in the bill

under discussion which has been recommended by the Appropriations Committee, whose members are men of long and broad experience. However, this bill contains one item to which I am unalterably opposed—not only because of the expenditure it would eventually involve but because I believe there is a principle at stake. I refer to the item for the development of Guam. I believe that it is incumbent upon the Members of Congress to view any situation affecting our country in its entirety. We all know that the Navy Department is favorable to the fortification of Guam for defense purposes, but in view of the proximity of this island to the coast of Japan, I am wondering if the fortification of Guam would not be interpreted by Japan as an affront and might serve to make even more tense the atmosphere between the United States and the Island Empire. A situation is rarely so bad that it cannot be made worse, and in these times of stress and strain it seems to me that the fortification of Guam would be adding fuel to the fire.

On May 17, 1938, Congress directed the Secretary of the Navy to appoint a board to investigate and report upon the need, for purposes of national defense, of additional submarine, destroyer, mine, and naval air bases on the coasts of the United States, its Territories, and possessions. No less an authority than Rear Admiral Arthur J. Hepburn was chairman of the investigating board. On January 3, 1939, the Secretary of the Navy submitted the so-called Hepburn report to the House. Permit me to read one paragraph from that report:

On December 18, 1919, the Joint Army and Navy Board recommended that "Guam be fortified and garrisoned adequate to its defense against any force that could be brought against it," and that a first-class naval base be prepared in Apra Harbor. The Washington Treaty of 1922 put an end to those plans, but that treaty has now expired.

Last year this House rightly and properly, in my opinion, rejected this proposal for the fortification of Guam. I believe it was then the consensus of opinion that this activity would at least appear like an unwarranted affront to Japan, but aside from that surmise it was largely conceded that it would be an unjustifiable expenditure because Guam is away and beyond our natural sphere of defense. But here we are again confronted with the same proposal, as carried in this naval appropriation bill under discussion, although, I dare say, no one would hardly contend that anything has happened in the interim to clear the atmosphere between this country of ours and Japan or to make the necessity for intelligently expanding our Navy less urgent.

My colleague on the Naval Affairs Committee the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MAAS] contends that it would be a wonderful thing to have an air base at Guam, where scouting planes could be on guard for the protection of the United States. I am sorry to disagree with him, but I frankly admit that it is somewhat beyond me to understand why we would want or need to have either Navy or Army planes scouting for purposes of protection some 5,000 miles away from the Pacific coast line of our country.

I am for a strong and thoroughly adequate national defense. In view of world conditions, I want to see our Navy efficiently built up and properly equipped so as to be able to defend the United States, and, if need be, this entire hemisphere; but I believe if we are to have a Navy capable of doing that we will have to concentrate our efforts on building such a Navy solely for defense purposes rather than unnecessarily and unwisely scattering our forces hither and yon over the face of the globe.

I hope this proposed expenditure for the development of Guam will be eliminated from this bill.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and Mr. RAYBURN having resumed the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. BLAND, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 8348, the naval appropriation bill for 1941, and had come to no resolution thereon.

EQUALIZATION OF LETTER CARRIERS (H. DOC. NO. 635)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read:

To the House of Representatives:

I return herewith, without my approval, H. R. 2001, Seventy-sixth Congress, entitled "An act for equalization of letter carriers."

I withheld my approval of bill H. R. 4285, passed by the Seventy-fifth Congress, which contained a similar provision and set forth my reasons therefor in a memorandum dated June 25, 1938, reading in part as follows:

Under existing law the annual salary rates for village delivery carriers are fixed at \$1,150 for grade 1, \$1,250 for grade 2, and \$1,350 for grade 3. This bill proposes to increase the salary rates of each grade by \$75 per year, or to \$1,225 for grade 1, \$1,325 for grade 2, and \$1,425 for grade 3. The bill also provides for the increase in the hourly pay of substitutes in said service from 50 to 55 cents. The salary rates for postal employees at post offices of the first-, second-, and third-classes were prescribed by the act approved February 28, 1925. Since that time the workweek was first reduced by law from 48 hours to 44 hours, and again further reduced to 40 hours, which in effect results in a decrease of 16 2/3 percent in service actually rendered for the same rate of pay. Until the financial situation of the Government becomes greatly improved and until the postal receipts and expenditures are brought more nearly into balance, I cannot, as a matter of sound policy, look with favor upon any proposed legislation which would provide for an increase in the salary rates of postal employees. I do not consider that there are sufficient reasons in support of this proposal to increase the salaries of village delivery carriers to justify an exception to the above-stated policy.

The bill, H. R. 2001, proposes to increase the minimum salary rate of carriers in the village delivery service from \$1,150 to \$1,200 and the maximum rate from \$1,350 to \$1,440, and the hourly rate for substitutes in that service from 50 to 60 cents an hour. This bill has been referred to the Postmaster General who advises that under the authority contained in the bill, should it become law, he proposes to fix the pay grades at \$1,200, \$1,320, and \$1,440, and that the additional annual cost of the bill would amount to about \$178,820. This would represent an increase of more than 10 percent in the annual cost of village delivery service.

My objections and observations respecting H. R. 4285, Seventy-fifth Congress, have equal application to this bill, H. R. 2001. I regret that I feel obligated to take this stand with respect to this class of employees, but I do not think that I would be justified in approving legislation that would give preferential treatment to this single group of employees.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 1940.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The objections of the President will be spread at large in the Journal.

Mr. BURCH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill and the President's message be referred to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads and ordered printed.

The motion was agreed to.

TRANSPORTATION AT GOVERNMENT EXPENSE OF CERTAIN AUTOMOBILES

The SPEAKER pro tempore also laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments:

To the Congress of the United States of America:

I commend to the favorable consideration of the Congress the enclosed report from the Secretary of State and the accompanying draft of proposed legislation designed to permit, where ocean transportation is necessary and subject to certain other limitations, the transportation at Government expense of personally owned automobiles by certain officers of the Foreign Service of the United States.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, February 13, 1940.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made this afternoon and to include therein certain excerpts from naval authorities.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a speech delivered by the Postmaster General on the first day of the issue of the Washington Irving stamps.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. JACOBSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and embody in them an editorial from the Birmingham Age-Herald.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend the remarks I made today in Committee of the Whole and to include brief quotations from the Board of Army Engineers.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

NATIONAL YOUTH CONGRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, rather than take the time of the House, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a radio speech that I delivered last night with regard to the solution of the American youth unemployment problem, and I will waive the time that was assigned to me.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MERRITT, indefinitely, on account of illness.

To Mr. EDMISTON, for 3 days, on account of business in his district.

To Mr. MOUTON (at the request of Mr. DeROUEN), for 10 days, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCRUGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, February 14, 1940, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization Wednesday, February 14, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., for the public consideration of H. R. 8023 and H. R. 8292.

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings at 10 a. m. on the following dates on the matters named:

On Wednesday, February 14, 1940, at 11 a. m., the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold hearings on H. R. 6983, to provide for the construction of a marine tuberculosis hospital in California.

Tuesday, February 20, 1940:

H. R. 4079, to amend sections 4353 and 4355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States.

H. R. 6751, to repeal certain laws with respect to manifests and vessel permits.

H. R. 5788, to amend the present law relating to the delivery of ships' manifests to collectors of customs by excluding Sundays and holidays from the time within which such delivery may be made by the master.

H. R. 5789, to amend the present law relating to the delivery of manifests to collectors of customs by excluding Sundays and holidays from the time within which such delivery may be made by the master.

Friday, February 23, 1940:

H. R. 7639, to provide for the examination of civilian nautical schools and for the inspection of vessels used in connection therewith, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs of the House in room 1310, New House Office Building, at 10:30 a. m., February 14, 1940, for the consideration of all bills pending before this committee relative to taxation of Tennessee Valley Authority properties.

COMMITTEE ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on the Public Lands on Wednesday, February 14, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., in room 328, House Office Building, to consider H. R. 2436.

COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS

There will be a meeting of the Committee on Naval Affairs on Wednesday, February 14, 1940, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 8026, to establish the composition of the United States Navy, and for other purposes.

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

On Wednesday, February 14, 1940, at 10 a. m., there will be a hearing before the Special Subcommittee on Bankruptcy and Reorganization of the Committee on the Judiciary on the bill (H. R. 8016) to amend an act entitled "An act to establish a uniform system of bankruptcy throughout the United States," approved July 1, 1898, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto (municipal compositions). The hearing will be held in room 346, House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON THE CENSUS

Beginning Tuesday, February 27, 1940, the Committee on the Census will hold hearings on the reapportionment of Representatives in Congress.

COMMITTEE ON PATENTS

The Committee on Patents, House of Representatives, will hold hearings Thursday, March 14, 1940, at 10:30 a. m., on H. R. 6877, to protect the United States in patent-infringement suits; and S. 547, to amend section 23 of the Copyright Act.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1391. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting sections II and III of chapter VI of part 3 of the Commission's over-all report on the study of investment trusts and investment companies made pursuant to section 30 of the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 (H. Doc. No. 279) was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SCRUGHAM: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 8438. A bill making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 1587). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. H. R. 8307. A bill to change the date of

transmission to Congress of the Budget of the United States in years in which a new President takes office; without amendment (Rept. No. 1588). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 3765. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act authorizing the attorney general of the State of California to bring suit in the Court of Claims on behalf of the Indians of California," approved May 18, 1928 (45 Stat. 602); without amendment (Rept. No. 1589). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MURDOCK of Arizona: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 7551. A bill authorizing payment to the San Carlos Apache Indians for the lands ceded by them in the agreement of February 25, 1896, ratified by the act of June 10, 1896, and reopening such lands to mineral entry; with amendment (Rept. No. 1590). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia: Committee on Appropriations. House Joint Resolution 456. Joint resolution making available for the fiscal year 1940 an additional amount from the special funds heretofore set up for the payment of compensation benefits authorized by certain emergency relief appropriations acts; without amendment (Rept. No. 1591). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAVENNER:

H. R. 8439. A bill to assist public agencies and nonprofit organizations in safeguarding the health of the Nation and to promote the general welfare; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. JOHNS:

H. R. 8440. A bill authorizing an appropriation for purposes of a memorial to Jean Nicolet; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. ARENDS:

H. R. 8441 (by request). A bill to afford greater protection to the purchaser of patent rights; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H. R. 8442 (by request). A bill to prohibit proof of acts done by an inventor in foreign countries; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 8443 (by request). A bill to give the Commissioner of Patents power to protect inventors by establishing adequate standards of professional conduct among attorneys; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 8444 (by request). A bill to permit the assignee of an application for letters patent to make certain supplemental applications; to the Committee on Patents.

H. R. 8445. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide additional protection for owners of patents of the United States, and for other purposes," approved June 25, 1910 (36 Stat. 851), as amended (40 Stat. 705; 35 U. S. C. 68), so as to protect the United States in certain patent infringement suits; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. BLOOM:

H. R. 8446. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act for the grading and classification of clerks in the Foreign Service of the United States of America, and providing compensation therefor," approved February 23, 1931, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK:

H. R. 8447. A bill to grant to home owners the right to extend the period for amortization of loans under section 4 (d) of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, and to reduce the rate of interest on such loans to 4 percent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HORTON:

H. R. 8448. A bill to provide for the extension of certain oil and gas-prospecting permits; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SPARKMAN:

H. R. 8449. A bill to extend the benefits of the United States Employees' Compensation Act to members of the Officers' Reserve Corps and of the Enlisted Reserve Corps of the Army who were physically injured in line of duty while performing active duty or engaged in authorized training between the dates of February 28, 1925, and July 15, 1939, both inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. JONES of Texas:

H. R. 8450. A bill to make permanent the reduced rates of interest on Federal land bank and land bank commissioner loans; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

H. R. 8451. A bill to authorize the construction of flood-control works on the Tennessee River at Chattanooga, Tenn., and Rossville, Ga.; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. GARTNER:

H. R. 8452. A bill to declare Frankford Creek, Pa., to be a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Maine:

H. R. 8453. A bill for the relief of the State Highway Commission of the State of Maine; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia:

H. J. Res. 456. Joint resolution making available for the fiscal year 1940 an additional amount from the special funds heretofore set up for the payment of compensation benefits authorized by certain emergency relief appropriations acts; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. J. Res. 457. Joint resolution for the transfer of the marketing laws survey to the Department of Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 458. Joint resolution designating the third Sunday in May of each year National Citizenship Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHANLEY:

H. Con. Res. 47. Concurrent resolution to effect an armistice in the Finnish-Soviet hostilities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HILL:

H. Res. 383. Resolution authorizing an investigation of the fruit industry to increase markets; to the Committee on Rules.

H. Res. 384. Resolution providing for the expenses of the select committee created by House Resolution 383; to the Committee on Accounts.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New York, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States against discrimination of older persons in the Federal civil service; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Alabama, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States to enact into law Senate bill 2420, known as the Federal mine-inspection bill; to the Committee on Mines and Mining.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BATES of Kentucky:

H. R. 8454. A bill for the relief of James R. Hess; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BRYSON:

H. R. 8455. A bill granting a pension to Dorace Ben Whiten; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COURTNEY:

H. R. 8456. A bill for the relief of the Union Bank of McEwen, Tenn.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

H. R. 8457. A bill for the relief of James M. Duggan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GREGORY:

H. R. 8458. A bill for the relief of Martha Morrison Hale, of Hickman, Ky.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEWIS of Colorado:

H. R. 8459. A bill for the relief of Edna S. Gardiner; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MOSER:

H. R. 8460. A bill granting a pension to Amelia H. Comings; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. O'NEAL:

H. R. 8461. A bill for the relief of Alice E. Shinnick; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 8462. A bill for the relief of John R. Beard; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. REES of Kansas:

H. R. 8463. A bill granting a pension to Thomas G. Red; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REECE of Tennessee:

H. R. 8464. A bill for the relief of H. S. Hill; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 8465. A bill for the relief of Walter T. Blackwelder; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 8466. A bill for the relief of William Bowen; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

6473. By Mr. ANDREWS: Petition of L. A. Pender and Felix Bilger, of Buffalo, N. Y., and sundry others; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6474. Also, resolution adopted by the Echo Society of Niagara Falls, N. Y., favoring the enactment of House Joint Resolution 412 for the relief of distressed and starving women and children of Poland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6475. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of sundry citizens of Lawrence, Mass., protesting against American participation in Japanese aggression against China in supplying war materials, particularly airplane gasoline, to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6476. Also, petition of sundry citizens of Saugus, Mass., requesting a strong move for international peace by urging the belligerents to declare a truce and to appoint delegates from each country to engage in a parley relative to possible conditions on which all sides could agree that would result in permanent peace without leaving conditions which would lead to further aggression; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6477. By Mr. FLAHERTY: Petition of the Department of Agriculture, Commonwealth of Massachusetts, State House, Boston, Mass., urging support of Senate bill 2212, to provide for the development of marketing and marketing services for farm commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6478. Also, petition of the Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Massachusetts branch, Boston, Mass., opposing establishment of military training in Civilian Conservation Corps; to the Committee on Labor.

6479. Also, petition of the Metropolitan District Dental Society, Boston, Mass., urging enactment of modern dental law for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

6480. By Mr. MARTIN J. KENNEDY: Petition of the Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Columbus, Ohio, concerning the

Logan-Walter administrative bill (H. R. 6324); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6481. Also, petition of the Queensboro Homing Pigeon Club, affiliated with the Combine Concourse Association, of Long Island, N. Y., urging support of House bill 7813, which guarantees the protection of the homing pigeon; to the Committee on Agriculture.

6482. By Mr. McKEOUGH (by request): Petition of Priscilla B. Sayre, of Chicago, Ill., and 29 others, favoring enactment of the proposed General Welfare Act (H. R. 5620); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6483. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of H. W. Shawhan, director, and J. W. Hesen, Jr., fish technician, Conservation Commission, of Charleston, W. Va., and the sportsmen of West Virginia, participating in the regional sportsmen's meeting, held at Morgantown, W. Va., January 31, 1940, and representing the counties of Hancock, Marshall, Monongalia, Gilmer, Preston, Ohio, Harrison, Doddridge, Brooke, Taylor, Lewis, and Marion, favoring the passage of the Mundt bill, in lieu of all other antipollution bills; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

6484. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Memorial of the New Jersey Society, Sons of the American Revolution, unalterably opposing Senate bill 1650, for, in the opinion of their organization, the measure is considered un-American, confiscatory, and destructive of rights to private property and leading to general centralized control of individual wealth and industry; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

6485. By Mr. WELCH: Brief submitted by the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, opposing House bill 7361, Seventy-sixth Congress, which proposes to take away the right of several States including California, to divide community property income for the purpose of Federal income tax; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6486. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Polish American Council and others (mass meeting), Chicago, Ill., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Polish relief; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 14, 1940

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Again, our Father in heaven, in the onward march of time we are brought together for another day. O God, we pray for the needs of men. May we be planted in that divine vineyard in which Thou art the husbandman, where the fruitless branches are cut away and those that bear fruit are cleansed that they may bear more fruit; thus whatsoever we doeth shall prosper, and we shall rejoice that there is no waste energy, no contagious doubt, and no annoying weariness. O river of God, flow this way, that its crystal tides may enrich the soil of our souls, bearing fruit in every good work. O Lord of life and light, we humbly pray Thee to let the golden morning break over this troubled world. May all peoples soon see the vision that transfigures sorrow, lightens the darkness, and immortalizes hope. Flowing from our hearts is a prayer for our beloved Speaker. In the name and for His glory, our Saviour. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 8237. An act to amend the District of Columbia Revenue Act of 1939.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3069. An act to provide for increasing the lending authority of the Export-Import Bank of Washington, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 7922) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Executive Office and sundry independent executive bureaus, boards, commissions, and offices, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1941, and for other purposes," disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. GLASS, Mr. BYRNES, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. ADAMS, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. HALE, and Mr. TOWNSEND to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following letter from the Clerk of the House:

The SPEAKER,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The certificate of election, in due form of law, of Hon. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN as a Representative-elect to the Seventy-sixth Congress, from the Fourteenth Congressional District of New York, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. William I. Sirovich, is on file in this office.

Very truly yours,

SOUTH TRIMBLE,

Clerk of the House of Representatives.

SWEARING IN OF MEMBER

Mr. M. MICHAEL EDELSTEIN presented himself at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION FUND, EMERGENCY RELIEF

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of House Joint Resolution 456.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the paragraph of the Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1940, under the heading "Employees' compensation fund, emergency relief," is hereby amended by striking out the sum "\$3,200,000" and inserting in lieu thereof the sum "\$4,700,000."

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand it, the amounts required to take care of and pay the compensation of W. P. A. employees who have been injured in line of duty has been exhausted, that funds available to meet these payments are gone.

Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia. That is correct.

I may say that when we started making relief appropriations the sum of \$25,000,000 was set aside and earmarked in the Treasury out of relief funds for the purpose of being administered by the Employees' Compensation Commission to pay claims of W. P. A. workers who were injured in line of duty, they being held under the law to be employees of the Government. From time to time Congress has authorized the use of a portion of this fund. During the current year we authorized the use of \$3,200,000. Subsequent to the time of that authorization relief expenditures were increased. The fund, therefore, has run out. This resolution authorizes an additional \$1,500,000 to be allocated from the fund heretofore set aside. It does not require the appropriation of any money, it is merely an authorization.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAUDE MAY MACARTHUR

Mr. WARREN. Mr. Speaker, from the Committee on Accounts, I present a privileged resolution (H. Res. 382, Rept. No. 1592) and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House to Maude May MacArthur, sister of James Bruce MacArthur, late an employee of the House, an amount equal to 6 months' salary compensation, and an additional amount not to exceed \$250, to defray funeral expenses of the said James Bruce MacArthur.